VOL. XIX. N° 76 OCTOBER 1904

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY

REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A., PH.D.

FELLOW OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE AND LECTURER IN DIPLOMATIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

CONTENTS

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

Price Five Shillings

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

SHORT NOTICES

MESSRS. LONGMANS & CO.'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

NEW ROMANCE BY MR. STANLEY WEYMAN.

THE ABBESS OF VLAYE.

By STANLEY J. WEYMAN,

Author of 'Under the Red Robe,' 'A Gentleman of France,' 'My Lady Rotha,' 'The Red Cockade,' &c.

Crown 8vo. 6s. [*Ready.*

THE TIGER OF MUSCOVY: a Romance of the Days of Ivan the Terrible. By FRED WHISHAW. Crown 8vo. 6s. [*Nearly ready.*

BORDERLAND TALES. By W. STEBBING, Author of 'Probable Tales,' &c. Crown 8vo. [*Nearly ready.*

*** *By the title, 'Borderland Tales,' the Author desires to suggest that the stories range on the confines of history, borrowing thence their setting, and something, he hopes, of the atmosphere.*

CONTENTS.—Humayun, the Great Mogul—The Wife of Jacques Cœur—The Innocent Infamy—A Conflict of Jurisdiction—Rival Confessors—A Humourist—A Martyr of Science.

THROUGH SPECTACLES OF FEELING: being Essays, mostly in Fiction. By the Author of 'Times and Days,' 'The Haggard Side,' &c. Crown 8vo. [*Nearly ready.*

MEMOIR OF ROSAMOND DAVENPORT HILL. By ETHEL E. METCALFE. With 4 Portraits. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net. [*Nearly ready.*

THE LIFE OF EDNA LYALL. By J. M. ESCREET. With Appreciations by the BISHOP OF RIPON, the BISHOP OF HEREFORD, and others. 2 Portraits. Crown 8vo. 5s. net. [*Nearly ready.*

LIFE AND ENERGY: an Attempt at a New Definition of Life; with Applications to Morals and Religion. A revised account of Four Addresses given at the Polytechnic Institute, Regent Street, London, by WALTER HIBBERT, F.I.C. A.M.I.E.E. Head of the Physics and Electrical Engineering Department at the Polytechnic Institute. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net. [*Nearly ready.*

THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By FREDERICH LIST. Translated by SAMPSON S. LLOYD. NEW AND CHEAPER EDITION. With an Introduction by J. SHIELD NICHOLSON, D.Sc. Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo. [*In the press.*

WORK AND WAGES: in continuation of Lord Brassey's 'Work and Wages' and 'Foreign Work and English Wages.' Vol. I.—FOREIGN COMPETITION. By SYDNEY J. CHAPMAN, M.A. Professor of Political Economy and Dean of the Faculty of Commerce in the Victoria University of Manchester. With an Introduction by LORD BRASSEY, K.C.B. D.C.L. LL.D. Medium 8vo. 7s. 6d. net. [*Ready.*

Vol. II.—CAPITAL AND LABOUR. [*In preparation.*

NEW VOLUME OF THE SILVER LIBRARY.

THE CRUISE OF THE 'FALCON.' A Voyage to South America in a 30-Ton Yacht. By E. F. KNIGHT, Author of 'The "Falcon" on the Baltic,' &c. With Maps and numerous Illustrations. NEW EDITION. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. [*Ready.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 39 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; New York, and Bombay.

THE ENGLISH
HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. LXXVI.—OCTOBER 1904

The Last Days of Silchester

IN the Roman period the corner of North Hampshire which we now call Silchester was a Romano-British town, Calleva Atrebatum. At the end of that period, early in the fifth century, this town was still occupied and inhabited, as the coins discovered in it sufficiently prove.[1] Then we lose sight of it in the general gloom. Somewhere in that dark age in which the whole Romano-British civilisation passed away Calleva also met its end. When next its site is mentioned, in Domesday and in the literature of the twelfth century, its Romano-British name has been utterly forgotten and it has ceased to be a dwelling-place of men.[2] Only its city walls must have stood then, as they stand to-day, the enduring monument of a vanished world.

Historians have endeavoured by conjecture to pierce the obscurity which thus surrounds the last days of Calleva. Generally and very naturally they have imagined that the town was stormed and burnt by invading English, and various dates have been suggested for the catastrophe. In particular Mr. J. R. Green, arguing partly from the general course of the English

[1] The coins found at Silchester have not yet been adequately recorded in print. I have, however, been able to look through the Reading Museum collection, and its curator, Mr. Colyer, has supplied me with useful details. Coins of the late fourth century, of Honorius (gold, silver, and bronze) and of Arcadius (gold, bronze), seem fairly common at Silchester, but no later emperor is represented and no items occur (except, perhaps, minims) which can be attributed with any special probability to post-Roman British minting.

[2] Geoffrey of Monmouth, vi. 5, ix. 1 and 15; Henry of Huntingdon, i. 3 (following Geoffrey); Alfred of Beverley, i. (following Henry). Compare *Eulogium Historiarum*, iv. 170 (vol. ii. p. 148, ed. F. S. Haydon): *Caersegent, Silecestre nominata, modo fere devastata.*

conquest (as he conceived it) and partly from supposed archæological evidence, placed the destruction of Calleva about the middle of the sixth century, probably between 552 and 568. It resisted longer (he thought) than any other British town of the Hampshire area, and its fall opened the way for a West-Saxon invasion of Surrey about 568 and of Bedfordshire in 571.[3] But the facts on which he relied are neither chronologically nor archæologically sound, and his theory must be rejected as in part wrong and in part unproved. I propose here to summarise the evidence available for the solution of the problem and to suggest a different answer. This answer may illustrate a new feature in the process by which Romano-British gave way to English.

Literary evidence is naturally wanting. Calleva is mentioned in no Roman or Romano-British literature, except in one or two itineraries and topographical lists; Silchester is mentioned in no English treatise earlier than 1066. Nor can we fill the gap by *a priori* theory. The history of the English conquest of Britain in its initial stages is imperfectly known. The dates and facts assigned by the Chronicle to the fifth and sixth centuries are few; they are also much less certain than Mr. Green assumed. We possess no general evidence which is minute enough to justify an assertion that Silchester 'must have' fallen at such and such a time or under such and such circumstances.

But it may be desirable in passing to notice one medieval author. Geoffrey of Monmouth, the first writer in the twelfth century who mentions the site, makes it the scene of the coronation of Constantine, Uther's father, and of the consecration of Arthur; he also enriches it with an Arthurian bishop, Mauganius.[4] Had he any warrant for this? Historians much more recent than Aaron Thompson have thought so. He may (in their opinion) have used some authority now lost, who preserved in one fashion or another a direct record, British and not English, of Roman and of post-Roman British history. It is not likely. Any such older authority would have called Calleva by its ancient name, and Geoffrey, true to his custom, would have adopted it. But he calls it by its English name of Silchester and by nothing else. Moreover his references to the place are very meagre; he does not include it among the chief cities of Britain, and he plainly knew next to nothing about it beyond its English name. Perhaps another suggestion may explain better how he came to mention it. He wrote in an antiquarian age, when Roman remains were eagerly noted and recognised as Roman in many parts of England —at Bath, for example, and Caerleon and Castor, and Carlisle and Pevensey. Silchester seems to have been noted with the rest as an ancient and therefore presumably a Roman site. It is men-

[3] *Making of England*, p. 113. [4] Geoffrey, *loc. cit.*

tioned not only by Geoffrey, but also by his contemporary Henry of Huntingdon. Henry was influenced by Geoffrey to include it in his list of British cities,[5] but he knows a little more about the spot than Geoffrey actually mentions, and he had probably heard of it independently. Here, perhaps, we touch the region of unrecorded current knowledge, and we may well believe that Geoffrey thus learnt of the ruined city walls and picked up the item as convenient to his purpose. That is why he both mentions it and yet calls it only by its English name and shows such ignorance about it. He goes on to invent a bishop for it, but that need surprise no one. Mauganius, prelate of Silchester, is kin to Boso, consul of Oxford, and Micipsa, king of Babylon, and Lucius Tiberius, procurator of the commonwealth, and several score others. They form the natural garniture of the medieval tale. We need pay no further attention to Geoffrey in our present quest.

Historical evidence often fails the historian; there remains archæology. This, for Silchester, is a recently acquired assistance. The first serious excavation of the spot was started by Mr. Joyce in 1864. The systematic exploration began in 1890. The work is now five-sixths done: we may ask its results.

First, it appears certain that the Romano-British town came actually and completely to an end. The area within the walls is waste and uninhabited to-day, save for a little church and farmhouse close to the eastern gate, and the excavations show that it has always remained uninhabited since the close of the Romano-British period. No trace of English dwellings or graves or other occupation has been found within it, or even in its neighbourhood. The church itself is not especially ancient, and it is natural to conclude that the site for many centuries lay practically desert.

Secondly, it appears certain that the end of Calleva did not come by fire and sword. It was not cut off and burnt by English enemies. Had it thus ended, the excavators would have discovered frequent traces of general conflagration and skeletons of townsfolk slain in fight or flight. Such have been found at Wroxeter, which we have reason to believe was stormed and destroyed; such also in numerous villas. At Silchester we meet with none of this; its end came otherwise.[6]

[5] This I pointed out in the *Athenaeum*, 6 April 1901. Henry, however, adds a vague indication of where Silchester is, which is not given by Geoffrey. I may add here that, so far as I can at present judge, Geoffrey's book contains nothing to suggest that he had anywhere before him any direct British record of Roman Britain which could be called historical.

[6] This was dimly recognised by Mr. Joyce (*Archaeologia*, xlvi. 362–3) and abundantly confirmed by the recent excavations (*Victoria Hist. of Hampshire*, i. 371). Green, misreading Joyce, quotes 'a legionary eagle found beneath a charred wreck.' But this, according to Joyce, is *débris* dating from a fire long anterior to the time when the town ceased to be inhabited. For the Wroxeter evidence see J. C. Anderson,

Thirdly, we have some slight evidence that the town passed through a period of decay before it ceased to exist. Some, if not all, of its gates were partly walled up—presumably because they could thus be more easily defended—and the material employed for the purpose includes worked stones from large buildings in Calleva. Such blocking of gateways has been found in other places—in the town of Caerwent (Venta Silurum), for example, and in the forts on Hadrian's Wall—and everywhere it seems to signify increasing danger or decreasing strength. The employment of worked stones from earlier buildings does not, however, necessarily imply that the town was decayed within as well as threatened from without. The Roman walls of places like Arlon and Sens are largely built with carved or worked stone torn from large and handsome structures, but it does not appear that these structures were in ruins when the walls were built. They were more probably dismantled in the hour of bitter need.[7] And at Silchester, so far as our present evidence goes, the amount of dismantlement need not have been very great.

Lastly, a strange object has been found which must be ascribed to the interval between the end of the Roman period (strictly so called) and the end of Calleva. In 1893 the excavators came upon a well or pit sunk rudely through the floor and outer wall of a corridor in a dwelling-house. In this pit, at a depth of five or six feet, lay a broken pillar bearing an ogam inscription, and below it a pewter vessel flattened out by its weight. The pit must have been dug after the corridor and its wall had fallen into ruin; the mouldings on the base of the pillar seem to be very late Roman; the occurrence of pewter harmonises with, if it does not demand, a late date. The ogam itself, according to Professor Rhys, might belong to the fifth or sixth century. It is imperfect, but in formula Celtic and sepulchral, and it might be translated 'the (grave) of Ebicatu-s . . . son of the kin of . . .,' though it seems uncertain whether it is actually an epitaph. In any case it is a Celtic and indeed Goidelic monument, with no Latin associations, since even the name Ebicatu-s is taken to be Celtic and not the Latin Evocatus. It is the only ogam yet found in England east of Severn and Exe. It is the only important object found in the Romano-British town which can be attributed with probability to the post-Roman British period.[8]

Uriconium, pp. 21–2; Thomas Wright, *Uriconium*, pp. 68, 114; Guest, *Origines Celticae*, i. 290 foll.

[7] Fox (*Silchester Report*, 1895, p. 29) adduces another item which he thinks significant of decay—a fine gallery in a house (xiv. 2) where masons had mixed their mortar as in a workshop and some one had lighted a fire on a costly mosaic floor. But this *might* occur without the town as a whole being in a state of decay.

[8] For the ogam see the *Silchester Report* for 1893 (*Archaeologia*, vol. liv.), the *Victoria Hist. of Hampshire*, i. 279, and Rhys and Brynmor Jones, *The Welsh People*,

Such is the evidence yielded by Calleva—slight but noteworthy. It is not perhaps discordant with the general history of the age in question. We know, generally, that the barbarians began seriously to menace the prosperity of Britain about the middle of the fourth century.[9] The assaults continued for a hundred years, until here, as elsewhere, the plunderers were superseded by immigrants invited or invading. Meanwhile Roman rule in northern Gaul had ceased, and Britain had been isolated from the empire. A Celtic revival followed. The native language, which had probably never wholly died out in the country districts, began again to spread, aided no doubt by the influences of Celtic Ireland; and with the language must have come a growth of native customs.[10] How fast the change progressed we cannot tell. It must have begun before the year 450, if a Vortigern then ruled Kent. It can be traced distinctly a century later in the pages of Gildas, though it had not then advanced so far as to obliterate in the minds of the British the notion that they belonged to the Roman empire. Later on the process was completed. Latin became merely the learned language of a Celtic-speaking people.

With these facts we can harmonise the details supplied by Calleva. The ogam falls into its place as a bit of Celtic revival. Some one in the fifth or sixth century set up this Celtic pillar at Calleva; then in the last days of the town it was thrown aside—or perhaps rather hidden out of sight and safe from insult, just like the Roman altars found in pits and wells in many Roman forts in northern Britain. The final extinction of town life also becomes intelligible, though it is not due to fire and fighting. It came rather by simple evacuation. As the English advanced, first as rough allies and then as rougher enemies, life became less and less attractive, not only in the forest region round Calleva,[11] but even within the shelter of its massive walls. At some moment or moments which we cannot fix the gateways were narrowed. At last the whole population arose and departed to some western land where the English had not yet appeared. The British at

pp. 55–65. The curious Colchester tablet, which I published in the *Archaeological Journal*, xlix. 215, with its concluding phrase, *nepos Vepogeni Caledo*, may show that the formula used on the Silchester ogam ('son of the kin of') was not unknown to Latin-speaking Britons as early as *circa* A.D. 235. But this may obviously be due to a stray Caledonian. In any case it is difficult to put the Silchester stone into the third century, though M. d'Arbois de Jubainville does seem to date ogams to the third century.

[9] Hence the expedition of Constans (Ammian. xx. 1), the first of many. In not a few Roman villas the latest coin finds date from about 350 A.D.

[10] Precisely the same revival can be seen still progressing in many parts of Austria, where German used to be the language of the towns and Ruthene or Slovene or the like the language of the peasants. Perhaps I may refer in this context to what I wrote in the *Edinburgh Review*, April 1899, pp. 387–8.

[11] The name Calleva means 'the town in the forest.' The country round it was very thinly populated in Roman times, and is heavily wooded to this day.

Silchester were literally exterminated: they fled 'beyond the border.'

We can parallel this 'extermination' from another part of the western empire, where the Roman civilisation perished as completely as in England. The province of Noricum Ripense, the land between Passau and Vienna, was a well-romanised district. The population was still Roman and still considered itself part of the empire in the middle of the fifth century. Its frontier forts and some of its towns had been destroyed in the course of the barbarian invasions, but it still held on in its walled settlements, and, as the empire could not help, it accepted the protection of the Rugi, on the opposite bank of the Danube. This availed little. The Rugi, like Hengist's people, were dangerous friends: other barbarians were as dangerous enemies. Life was hardly safe inside the towns, and those who ventured outside were liable to be caught up by marauders. The burden became intolerable. One town after another was abandoned. The inhabitants of Quintana retired in a body to Batava, the inhabitants of Batava soon after to Lauriacum, and in turn the occupants of Lauriacum retired to Favianae. They left their old homes desolate and uninhabited; no man dwelt in them, no trader found there any one with whom to traffic. A very few here and there declined to leave their native soil and attempted to occupy still the deserted towns: their immediate fate was death or slavery at the hands of the barbarians. At last in 488 Odoacer, who ruled Italy in the name of the eastern emperor, came to the aid of the survivors and, as the only remedy, transported them in a body from Noricum to Italy. From that day the north of Noricum ceased to be Roman in civilisation as in government.[12]

A kindly biographer has told us how and when the romanised town-life ended on the Danube. We have no such written evidence for Britain. But the process was plainly similar. It remains only to ask the date. It were easy to accept Mr. Green's theory of the conquest and simply substitute evacuation for destruction by fire and sword. But that theory is not, in itself, very probable. The early dates of Saxon history are untrustworthy. Geographically it is more likely that an attack on Silchester would come from the Thames valley than from the Itchen. The known facts of early English history suggest an earlier period than 560. Gildas, for instance, wrote somewhere about A.D. 540–550,[13] and no reader of Gildas would suppose that in his time the Britons held parts of Surrey and Hampshire within forty-five miles of London.

[12] *Eugippii Vita Severini* (ed. Mommsen, 1898). Eugippius distinctly implies that the evacuation was general and not confined to the rich. The south of Noricum, of course, retained a form of the Roman language, and was no doubt not evacuated.

[13] So Mommsen and Zimmer. Compare W. H. Stevenson, *Academy*, 26 Oct. 1895

Mr. Green, I think, has overrated 'the ring of fortresses' (as he calls them) 'which enclosed the Gwent.'[14] Calleva may have ranked as a fortified place. The other two, Sorbiodunum (Sarum) and Cunetio (near Marlborough), are to the student of Roman Britain mere villages or post-stations. We cannot, with our present evidence, decide the time when the Callevan Britons lost heart and fled; now we can only perceive that at some date or other the town thus ceased to exist. To complete the tale we need other evidence, not yet discovered. It may be that when archæologists have at last scientifically studied the chronology of English fibulae and burials the historian may learn from their conclusions another fragment of history.

F. Haverfield.

[14] It should be added that the term Gwent, as used by Mr. Green, has no proper authority. It seems to have been invented in recent times out of the place-name Venta, which was used of three little towns in Roman Britain. The etymology and meaning of this name Venta seem quite unknown.

The Canon Law of the Divorce

THE history of the divorce of Henry VIII has by this time been investigated with quite extraordinary thoroughness. The Record Office and the British Museum have been repeatedly ransacked; nearly all the chief private collections have been reached through the Historical Manuscripts Commission; the diplomatic correspondence of the envoys of foreign courts has been printed or summarised, and more recently Dr. Ehses has edited a valuable collection of Roman documents from the archives of the Vatican.[1] Perhaps not the least service which this last publication has rendered was to call forth the three masterly articles by Dr. James Gairdner which appeared in the *English Historical Review* for 1896 and 1897. These for the first time brought all the confusing details into focus, and must be regarded as by far the best and most authoritative presentment of the subject which has hitherto been published. But there is one point with regard to which even Dr. Gairdner's clear exposition leaves the reader unsatisfied—a point which, as I venture to think, he has himself somewhat misconceived. The question is one rather of canon law than of history, but it has an important bearing on other facts. As I do not believe that the matter has ever been put in its true light by any of the many writers on the divorce, I am tempted to ask for space to discuss the difficulty here.

Cardinal Campeggio reached London on 8 Oct. 1528. During all the later stages of his journey he had suffered a martyrdom from repeated attacks of gout, and he was unable to take part in the public reception which had been organised in his honour. The king was in a fever of impatience to have the divorce question settled offhand. Not only had every means been tried to accelerate Campeggio's slow progress through France, but now that the Italian cardinal had reached his destination he was not allowed a day to repose himself, all ill and weary as he was, before the business he had come upon was mooted. During more than a week

[1] *Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England* (Paderborn, 1893). Another letter of Campeggio's, which Dr. Ehses has since discovered at Naples, has been published by him in the *Römische Quartalschrift* for 1900.

he lay in bed unable to set foot to the ground, but Wolsey came to visit him repeatedly, and for three or four hours at a stretch sought to persuade him that all idea of a reconciliation between the king and queen must be abandoned, and that the only possible solution was to be found in a divorce. The king's people here, Campeggio reported, are quite past listening to reason, and 'they not only want to have it all their own way, but require that everything should be done with the utmost despatch.' So impatient was the king that he moved to another palace which was near Campeggio's lodging; and though the latter, as he complained piteously to Salviati, could still neither ride nor stand, and hardly even sit, he was compelled to wait upon his majesty and to go through all the weary formalities of a first audience. Every letter of Campeggio's at this period shows that the pressure put upon him to expedite matters was tremendous. To any one who considers these letters and at the same time remembers the extraordinarily ample terms in which the papal commission was granted, it would appear quite incredible that eight months should have been allowed to elapse before the process of the divorce had advanced a single stage. None the less, though Campeggio had landed on English soil before the last day of September 1528, it was not until 31 May 1529 that the legatine court was opened.

With regard to the immediate cause of this delay there can be no serious difference of opinion. The diplomatic correspondence of the period makes it abundantly clear that the production of a second and hitherto unknown dispensation, granted by Julius II in the form of a brief, had for some reason or other brought the divorce proceedings to a standstill. Nothing, the two legates declared in a joint letter to the pope, could be done until the question of the brief was disposed of. Either they must have powers to require the production of the original and to pronounce upon its authenticity, or else Clement himself must intervene and take the matter into his own hands. They suggest—or rather Wolsey suggests; for Campeggio in a private despatch to Rome makes it clear that he only signed the letter to avoid a rupture with his colleague—that the pope might revoke the cause and himself deliver sentence in favour of Henry, or else that he might issue a new decretal and declare the brief a forgery. Without some such drastic remedy it seemed impossible to go on. At the same time immense efforts were made in England to obtain possession of the original brief. Both Mr. Brewer and Dr. Gairdner have told the story of the oath so disgracefully extorted from Catherine, by which she pledged herself to entreat the emperor to surrender the document. Both have also dwelt upon the negotiations continued for weary months with the object of inducing the pope to interfere or require Charles at least to show the brief in Rome.

The puzzle is that when we come to inspect the text of the document which brought about this deadlock and caused all the disturbance, it seems to be substantially identical with the bull, the authenticity of which was undisputed. Only in one particular have modern critics noted any significant divergence. The brief takes the consummation of the marriage between Arthur and Catherine absolutely for granted, *cum matrimonium per verba legitime de praesenti contraxeritis illudque carnali copula consummaveritis*; whereas the bull, while granting the dispensation in the fullest terms, at the same time suggests a doubt as to the consummation, *cum matrimonium per verba legitime de praesenti contraxissetis illudque carnali copula forsan consummavissetis*. It was, we are told, the presence of this word *forsan* which did all the mischief. Mr. Pocock in his edition of Burnet calls attention to the change by printing the significant words in italics. And from the following passage in his *History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century* Dr. Gairdner seems evidently to agree that the vital feature of the brief is to be sought for in its reference to the fact of consummation :—

> But the king's desire to hasten the trial was soon checked when Catherine showed Campeggio a copy of the brief of Julius II for her marriage with Henry—the brief which, as we have seen, was issued before the bull. The brief really cut away the ground on which the king rested his case, because it was granted on information that Prince Arthur had actually consummated his marriage with her. This statement the king himself knew perfectly well to be false, but he had relied on the fact that the presumption was in its favour and that the testimony of Catherine to the contrary could not be admitted as evidence. What was to be said now, when, even supposing it to be true, there was actually a dispensation which met the case exactly ?[2]

Now, although I feel that it is somewhat presumptuous to disagree with so high an authority, still I find it very hard to accept the suggestion made, or at least implied, in Dr. Gairdner's explanation. There is no evidence, I think, to show that at this stage, or indeed at any stage, Henry maintained the dispensation to be invalid because Julius had granted it on the supposition that the previous marriage with Arthur had not been consummated. If it could have been proved that Julius issued the bull in this belief, there would no doubt have been serious ground to contest its validity, always of course assuming that the first marriage had really been consummated, as Henry pretended. The dispensation would in that case have been 'obreptitious,' in the phraseology of the canonists —that is, obtained by false representations. But, as Dr. Ehses has pointed out, the very terms in which the dispensation bull was

[2] *A History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 93. Cf. *English Historical Review*, 1897, pp. 237–8.

couched proved conclusively that this was not the case. The bull was issued to remove the impediment of *affinity*, and it was the unanimous teaching of that age, as it is in the Roman church still, that from a marriage that was merely *ratum* and not *consummatum* the impediment of affinity did not result.[3] There would indeed have been an impediment to prevent the marriage of Henry and Catherine, even though Arthur and his bride had parted at the church door and Arthur had died without ever seeing her again. But this was the impediment known as *publicae honestatis iusticia*, not *affinitas*. It was undoubtedly a weak point in the dispensation bull that it made no formal mention of the *publica honestas*; and this Wolsey perceived when the king first opened the matter to him.[4] But when the dispensation bull did away with the impediment of *affinity* it undoubtedly assumed thereby that the marriage had been consummated; and the introduction of the word *forsan* constituted in fact an inconsistency which in some measure justifies Wolsey's stringent criticism on the drafting of that instrument.[5]

[3] According to the definition common at this period, 'Affinitas est personarum proximitas omni carens parentela, proveniens ex coitu maritali vel fornicaria.' See, for instance, the treatise *De Consanguinitate et Affinitate* of Stephanus Costa, printed in the great Venetian collection of 1584, vol. ix. fol. 134 *seq.*, or the *Rosella Casuum*, ed. Venice, 1495, s.v. *Impedimentum*, fol. 275. It would be easy to pile up references on the point from Sanchez and other authorities who have studied the canonists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; see Sanchez, *De Matrimonio*, lib. vii. disp. 64. No doubt some earlier writers, e.g. St. Thomas Aquinas, had held that *affinitas* might result from *matrimonium ratum* without consummation (see Sanchez, *ib.* n. 24); but the terminology of the thirteenth century was somewhat confused, and, as Freisen in his very useful *Geschichte des canonischen Eherechts*, p. 502 *seq.*, has noted, the impediment which was afterwards known as *publicae honestatis iusticia*, was often at this early period described as *quasi-affinitas*. In the civil law affinity was apparently held to follow from any *matrimonium ratum*; but Baptista a S. Blasio in his list of *Contradictiones Iuris Canonici cum Iure Civili*, n. 42, notes expressly that in the canon law no impediment of affinity arose unless there had been consummation in the full and unequivocal sense.

[4] See Brewer, *Calendar*, 1527, 3217; *State Papers*, i. 194. The Spanish advisers saw this point as well as Wolsey, and they dissuaded Catherine from basing her case on the non-consummation of the previous marriage (Gayangos, *Spanish Calendar*, vol. iii. pt. 2, pp. 819 and 843).

It may be worth while to explain that, according to the canon law, whenever two parties have been formally contracted to one another, whether by betrothal in the strict sense (*sponsalia de futuro*) or by the marriage ceremony (*matrimonium ratum* or *sponsalia de praesenti*), a diriment impediment is thereby created, which would invalidate the marriage of either with any one of the other's near relatives. This impediment is now called *publica honestas*, but its true character appears best from the name which it bears in the old canonists, i.e. *quasi-affinitas* (see Freisen, *Geschichte des canonischen Eherechts*, p. 503, and Schulte, *Lehrbuch*, p. 412). If the marriage between Arthur and Catherine was never more than *ratum*, she was still prevented from marrying Henry by the impediment of *publica honestas*.

[5] See the joint letter of Wolsey and Campeggio in Burnet (ed. Pocock), iv. 102. The man who drafted the bull, they argue, must have been half asleep (*dormitaverit*): the framer of the brief, on the other hand, was only too suspiciously wide awake to every point.

In the face of this clear dispensation from affinity it would have been very ill-advised to contend that Pope Julius had been led to believe that there was no consummation—in other words, that there was no affinity at all. And as a matter of fact I cannot find the slightest indication that Wolsey or any of the king's agents ever maintained that the dispensation was obreptitious because the pope had been persuaded that Catherine and Arthur had never cohabited. We have a number of documents explaining fully the objections raised against the dispensing bull, objections in virtue of which the bull was alleged to be surreptitious and obreptitious, and therefore invalid. There exist no fewer than three drafts of commissions which it was hoped that the pope might be induced to sign and in which the grounds for setting aside the dispensation are recited at length. There are also Wolsey's elaborate instructions to Sir Gregory Casale, and various other notes and memoranda. What is more, we possess at least two summaries of the same objections as taken down by the Roman canonists with a view to their discussion and refutation. But in none of these papers is the suggestion made that the dispensation was invalid because it expressed a doubt as to the consummation of the marriage between Arthur and Catherine. Not only is this difficulty not raised as the principal objection to the bull of Julius, but it is not in the slightest way alluded to. Dr. Gairdner himself gives the following summary of objections in one of these Roman documents printed by Ehses:—

> In fact the five grounds now (December 1527) and for some time after insisted on were these:
>
> First, it was alleged in the bull that Henry desired the marriage, which was not true, for he never asked for it or knew of the obtaining of the dispensation.
>
> Second, it was stated that the marriage was contracted for the sake of preserving peace and alliance—an insufficient reason, especially as there had been no war, and there was no danger of one at that time.
>
> Third, because Henry was only twelve years old when the dispensation was obtained, and therefore not of lawful age.
>
> Fourth, because some of the persons named in the bull were dead before it was put into force, and therefore the document must have been surreptitious.
>
> Fifth, that Henry, on reaching the age of fourteen, had made a protestation that he would not marry Catherine, by which the previous dispensation was rendered null and a subsequent marriage was not valid without a new one.[6]

I am not for the moment concerned to appraise the value of these difficulties as technical points in canon law. I wish only to

[6] *English Historical Review*, 1896, p. 689; Ehses, *Römische Dokumente*, p. 21. The order given in the Roman summary is not that of the English documents. In these latter the question of the peace (no. 2) always stands in the first place.

point out that they contain no reference to the *forsan* clause or the question of consummation. How then can it be said that when suddenly a dispensation was produced, identical in substance with the former but omitting the word *forsan*, the king's agents were paralysed for six months because the 'brief cut away the ground on which the king rested his case'? The striking point is that no less a person than Wolsey himself, when writing to his agents abroad at this period, speaks of the omission of the word *forsan* by the supposed forger of the brief as a quite unnecessary change. In the memorial sent to the English ambassadors instructing them as to the replies to be made to the allegations of the emperor they are directed to draw attention to the suspicious features of the brief, and more particularly to note that 'it corrects the errors (*vitia*) in the bull which have lately been brought to light, and that to a quite unnecessary extent, as in omitting the word *forsan* lest it should suggest a doubt.'[7]

For all this there seems no need to deny that the brief did really 'cut away the ground upon which the king rested his case,' though it was not, I think, the word *forsan* which had anything to say to it. But to explain my point fully it is necessary to go back some little way.

No one who has ever read the original despatches of the English envoys printed by Burnet and Pocock can easily forget the dramatic story of the fight for the decretal commission in the spring of 1528. The diplomatic badgering and browbeating which the unfortunate pontiff underwent at the hands of Gardiner and his colleagues, the effrontery with which the envoys declared that justice was on their side, and the persistence with which they threatened the pope with the defection of the whole English nation if he refused compliance, might well have shaken the constancy of a more resolute man than Clement VII. He did not give way to the extent that the ambassadors hoped he would. He did not commit himself to any step that was really irretrievable. But he certainly made an unwise and weak concession, a concession which, as he afterwards said, he would have chopped off one of his fingers to recall. Though the public decretal commission which had been so persistently asked for was withheld, Clement did ultimately under extreme pressure consent to issue a secret document of the same nature which might inform the consciences of the legates and might be shown to the king, but of which otherwise no use was to be made. It is only of late years that English historians have come to perceive what was meant by this 'decretal commission,' of which we hear so much in the divorce proceedings, and to understand in what it differed from the 'general commis-

[7] Brewer, p. 2267, n. 4. I assume that these instructions must have emanated directly or indirectly from Wolsey.

sion' in virtue of which the legatine court of Wolsey and Campeggio was actually constituted. Even in the time of Henry VIII such instruments, modelled, as the name suggested, upon the *litterae decretales*, the written decisions of cases, issued by the popes, especially in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, had gone out of fashion. When Clement was pressed to adopt the draft commission prepared by the English agents in this form he declared repeatedly that such documents were quite foreign to the existing usage of the chancery. In itself the conception of a decretal commission contains nothing difficult or intricate. It was, as Dr. Gairdner quite correctly says, merely a commission setting forth the law by which the legates were to be guided, leaving to them the examination of the facts.[8] Simple as the idea may be, Stephen Gardiner seemed to expect that the pope would not be familiar with it, and in one of his audiences, as he tells us, he recited to the pontiff by heart the whole of the chapter *Veniens* from the title *De Sponsalibus* in the decretals of Gregory IX, apparently to give Clement an idea of what was meant by this kind of commission. Perhaps it may help to the understanding of the present difficulty if we also recall here the contents of this same chapter *Veniens*.

A certain man, E., had lived with a woman, had had children by her, and had formally promised her marriage in the presence of witnesses. It chanced, however, that he was found under compromising circumstances with another man's daughter, and the father of this second girl compelled him then and there to take her for his wife *per verba de praesenti*. Under these circumstances E. applied to the pope to know which of the two women he was bound to regard as lawfully married to him. Hereupon the pope, after reciting these facts and declaring that he had been unable to ascertain whether E. had had intercourse with the first woman *after* pledging his troth to her (*post fidem praestitam*), commits the case to the decision of a delegate, probably the local ordinary, and proceeds thus :—

> Therefore we ordain that thou (the delegate) diligently inquire into the facts, and if thou findest that he had carnal knowledge of the first woman after pledging her his troth, that then thou compel him to live with her; otherwise thou must make him take the second for his wife; unless indeed at the time of contracting with her he was under the influence of such terror as would have overpowered a man of average constancy.

Here we have the essence of the decretal commission. The law is decided beforehand. The only question left to the delegate to determine is one of fact. If it be found that there was carnal intercourse between E. and the first woman subsequently to the troth-pledging, then they are man and wife. If otherwise, a

[8] *English Historical Review*, xii. 8, 1897.

second issue has to be decided, namely, whether E. at the moment of contracting with the other woman was under the influence of incapacitating terror; if not, he is bound to live with her.

Now a sentence pronounced in accordance with such instructions may be said to have been confirmed beforehand, and offered much less excuse for appeals and delays. Moreover when we examine in the various drafts of the proposed decretal commission what the issues of fact were, upon the answer to which Henry desired to make the whole question of the validity of the marriage turn, we begin to appreciate to what an indefensible piece of legal trickery Clement was asked to commit himself.[9] With regard to the secret decretal which actually was accepted by the pope, though under such severe restrictions as rendered it innocuous in the safe hands of Campeggio, we really are much in the dark both as to the provisions of the document itself and as to the importance which the legates were prepared to attach to it in their conduct of the case. The course of subsequent events seems to me to be best explained if we suppose first that the secret decretal did not differ materially from the drafts which are preserved to us, and secondly

[9] It is strange that a modern writer (I refer to Father Taunton in his *Thomas Wolsey, Legate and Reformer*) should maintain that in resisting the demands of the English envoys Clement was refusing not only what was just in itself but what the pope saw to be just. 'He knew,' we are told, 'that if he inquired into the case, *as put by Wolsey*, justice based on his own laws would probably demand a verdict for the king' (p. 188). In italicising the words '*as put by Wolsey*' Father Taunton no doubt wishes to recall Wolsey's first suggestion, on which this writer much insists, that the dispensation was defective because it made no reference to the impediment of *publica honestas*. But, first, this objection was only put forward by Wolsey on the supposition that the marriage with Arthur was not consummated, a position which the king throughout refused to recognise. And secondly, what is still more to the point, we can see by the instructions sent by Wolsey to Casale, from the draft bulls prepared in England, from the summaries of the English objections, and from the reports of the envoys themselves, that in the negotiations at the papal court during the first half of 1528 this question of *publica honestas* was either never raised or, if raised, was certainly not insisted on. The five points of objection which *were* urged against the dispensation bull have been already given above. These still remained the foundation on which the king based his case until the cause was revoked to Rome in July 1529. Then Henry, becoming careless whether he offended the pope or not, fell back on the fundamental position, which had been in his mind all along, that the pope had no power to dispense for marriage with a deceased brother's widow. Throughout the remainder of the proceedings the whole brunt of the controversy turned upon this contention, as is shown by the various printed 'Consultations' on the subject, e.g. by Fisher, Previdelli, Raphael Comensis, Vives, and many others. (There is an excellent collection of some of the rarest of these tracts in the Grenville Library at the British Museum, which I have carefully examined.) With this central difficulty various subordinate objections were combined, notably by Cranmer (printed in Pocock's *Records*, i. 334 *seq.*), and amongst the rest the absence of any mention of *publica honestas* in the dispensation was duly noted. If the non-consummation of the marriage with Arthur had been admitted, then perhaps the error concerning the nature of the impediment which existed between Henry and Catherine might have been considered a real technical difficulty, which called for fuller investigation. But where consummation was assumed, and the relation of the parties fully described, no solid ground existed for requiring a mention of *publica honestas* as well as *affinitas*.

that the legates, notably Wolsey, were anxious to base their procedure upon the issues therein suggested. What would actually have happened with regard to appeals and papal confirmation if the legatine court had come to a decision it is impossible even to conjecture. The pope's idea at any rate seemed to be that the decretal was to be treated as absolutely non-existent, and the document was in fact destroyed by Campeggio long before the trial, in accordance with the instructions he had received. On the whole Dr. Gairdner seems to be thoroughly justified in his belief that the pope never intended it to be any more than a dead letter granted for appearance sake to save Wolsey's credit with the king and in answer to his desperate appeals.

But the more the pope was satisfied that the decretal was to remain inoperative the more likely he was to pass it substantially in the form in which it had been submitted to him. If we want to know what its provisions really were, we shall probably be quite safe in believing that it followed closely the general arrangement of the three drafts of such a decretal commission which are still preserved to us. One of these is in the Record Office, and has been printed entire by Mr. Pocock; another in the Cotton MS., Vitellius, B, xii., was published long ago by Burnet. The third, which is in the same volume as the last-named, has never, I think, been printed, though from the fact that it is made out to Wolsey and Campeggio together it is likely to be of more recent date than either of the others. Indeed, there seems every probability that it is a copy of the document actually taken to Rome by Gardiner. Now the first thing we notice in examining any one of these drafts —the variations between them are in substance comparatively slight—is that in the course of the preliminary statement formal reference is made to the bull of dispensation in virtue of which the marriage between Henry and Catherine took place: *cuius quidem dispensationis tenor sequitur, et est talis.* Whereupon is set down the complete text of the bull of Julius II, duly recited at length. Now a moment's reflexion at once shows the important bearing of this fact upon the problem of the brief and upon the consternation which it excited. If the brief was authentic its existence practically nullified the secret decretal. The whole commission is directed to testing the validity of a certain definite instrument imbedded in its context. When, therefore, the queen replies by producing another instrument altogether, to which no reference is made, and declares that this was the dispensation acted upon, it is obvious that the pains hitherto spent have been thrown away. The bull, indeed, may be declared void and of no effect, but the validity of the marriage no longer depends upon that. If the brief is to be pronounced upon also, an entirely new decretal commission will have to be obtained and all the tedious Roman negotiations must begin

afresh. This fact only becomes more patent when we consider the wording of the significant portion of the draft decretals. I quote from the unprinted one, made out in the names of Wolsey and Campeggio jointly.

Vobis (committimus vices nostras) coniunctim et ut prefertur divisim ad cognoscendum et procedendum summarie et de plano sine strepitu et figura iudicii in causa predicta, necnon de et super viribus sive validitate dicte bulle sive dispensacionis inquirendum, bullam sive dispensacionem, si vicia predicta aut eorum aliqua vera esse constiterit, et vel pacem que in bulla pretenditur sine matrimonio predicto continuari potuisse et permanere, vel dictum charissimum filium nostrum ut allegabatur non cupiisse contrahere matrimonium ad hoc ut pacis federa conservarentur, aut denique reges in bulla nominatos aut aliquem eorum ante mandatam executioni bullam fatis concessisse apparuerit, ipsam bullam nullam, minus validam, ex subreptione et obreptione inefficacem, irritam et inanem fuisse semper et esse pronunciandum et declarandum, matrimonium autem predictum, quod eiusdem virtute consistere videretur, nullum simul ac minus legitimum esse ac pro nullo minusque legitimo haberi debere decernendum, ipsos porro contrahentes ab omni contractu matrimoniali huiusmodi liberos et consortio coniugali quod hactenus observarunt separari deberi sentenciandos et auctoritate nostra separandos; denique utrique ad contrahendum etc.[10]

It will be noticed that reference is made throughout to the terms of the 'aforesaid bull or dispensation,' i.e. that which is cited at length towards the beginning of the document. If the legates after investigation of the facts should find either that the peace with Spain could have been maintained without the said marriage, or that 'our dear son' Henry did not desire to contract the marriage to cement the peace as alleged, or that the royal personages named

[10] MS. Vitellius, B. xii., fol. 133. It is curious that, whether by accident or design, all reference to the so-called 'renunciation' (i.e. Prince Henry's protest in 1505) is omitted here, though it is alluded to earlier in the document. The reply made in Rome to this plea was that even though Henry, through the protest referred to should be held to have renounced the dispensation, Catherine, to whom it was equally addressed, certainly had not, and hence the validity of the concession remained untouched. The English canonists may well have felt that this answer was unassailable. Sanchez quotes many authorities for the opinion, now generally received, that a dispensation once obtained remains good, even though the person in whose favour it is obtained renounces it, always supposing that the renunciation is not formally accepted by the authority which granted the dispensation (*De Matrimonio*, lib. viii. disp. 32, n. 5). But Bartholomaeus de Spina (*De Potestate Papae*, nn. 117–118), writing at an earlier period, seems to show that there was some difference of opinion on the point. It is certain in any case that Prince Henry's protest, made at his father's instance, was never intended seriously to stand in the way of his marriage with Catherine. Moreover Dr. Ehses has printed a brief addressed to Henry (though by a blunder Arthur's name appears in the draft) four months after the protest, granting a request made in his name to release 'Catherine his wife' (i.e. espoused to him *per verba de futuro*) from certain vows of devotion; and again, in a letter addressed by the young Prince Henry to King Ferdinand, 9 April 1506, he refers to Catherine as 'la princesse ma femme' (Gairdner, *Letters and Papers of Richard III and Henry VII*, i. 285).

therein, or any one of them, died before the bull was carried into effect, in all or any of these cases they are to pronounce the dispensation bull itself null and void, as having been obtained by subreption and obreption, while the marriage, 'which would seem to stand only in virtue of this bull,' is to be declared unlawful and invalid from the beginning, the parties contracting it being absolutely free. Here plainly the law is declared and the investigation narrowed to certain issues of fact, but the whole procedure has reference to a particular form of dispensation of which the text is cited in the commission itself, and can apply to no other.

Of course we do not know how far the secret decretal adhered to these lines, nor again how far Wolsey and Campeggio considered themselves bound to conform to the procedure it indicated. Seeing, however, that the latter had instructions to gain all the time he could, he may well have insisted, when it suited his purpose, on adhering rigidly to the path traced out. After all, the king and his agents had fallen into the pit which they themselves had dug, and it was not for Campeggio to help them out of the difficulty. After the researches of Bergenroth, Friedmann, Busch, and Ehses there can, I think, be no reasonable doubt of the authenticity of the brief, but even had it been a forgery one might feel a certain admiration for the smartness of the trick by which the king's carefully planned decretal commission was so simply rendered inoperative.

But let me come finally to the most important point I have to make. Even independently of the decretal commission there is one noteworthy difference between the wording of the bull and the brief which would alone be sufficient to account for the dead-lock occasioned by the production of the latter. The resemblance of the two instruments in their general purport, and even in their details, is at first sight so complete that one is at a loss to understand the language in which Wolsey in the joint letter of the legates and in sundry instructions sent to the English envoys persistently contrasts the two. The brief, he declares, is on the very surface of it a suspicious document, because it remedies so aptly the shortcomings in the drafting of the bull, and because it foresees objections which at the time it was issued would have occurred to no one. None the less the writer is not thinking of the omission of the word *forsan*, because, as we have seen, this is described as a change that was even over-cautious and unnecessary. What then was this vital modification which remedied the weak points of the bull and brought the king's great matter to a standstill? The solution of the difficulty is contained, if I mistake not, in a very short passage of the brief, which may be conveniently set side by side with the corresponding expressions in the bull.

The Bull.	*The Brief.*
Cum autem . . . sicut eadem petitio subiungebat ad hoc ut huiusmodi vinculum pacis et amicitiae inter praefatos reges et reginam diutius permaneat, cupiatis matrimonium inter vos . . . contrahere . . . supplicari nobis fecistis . . . Nos . . . huiusmodi supplicationibus inclinati . . . vobiscum . . . dispensamus.	Quia tamen . . . huiusmodi vinculum pacis et connexitatis inter praefatos reges et reginam ita firmiter verisimiliter non perduraret nisi etiam illud alio affinitatis vinculo confirmaretur, ex his *et certis aliis causis* desideratis matrimonium . . . contrahere . . . supplicari nobis fecistis. . . . Nos . . . his *et aliis causis animum nostrum moventibus*, huiusmodi supplicationibus inclinati . . . vobiscum. . . dispensamus.

To appreciate the full significance of this change it is necessary to have some idea of the importance always attached in the canon law to the *motive* alleged in the granting of any dispensation. The king's technical objections against the validity of the dispensation bull (summarised above on p. 636) may appear to us now to be quibbling and trivial in the extreme, but they would have seemed of more serious weight to the canonist of that period, for he would have admitted that they were presented in due form, and that they attacked what was likely to be the weak point in any such concession. Despite Henry's later efforts to establish the contrary, it was the almost universally received opinion in that day (and in the Roman church at present the point is disputed by no one) that the pope had power to dispense for a marriage with a deceased wife's sister or a deceased husband's brother. But while all or nearly all held that the impediment could be removed by dispensation, not a few regarded the impediment itself as existing *iure divino*. If, therefore, the pope had power to dispense at all, he was not in the position of a lawgiver who was free even arbitrarily and without reason assigned to permit exceptions to his own laws, but he was rather in the position of one administering the laws of his superior. Such a delegate may, indeed, dispense in certain cases, but he is only free to do so for a good and valid reason.[11] If the cause assigned is fictitious or inadequate, then the dispensation is null and void. It was therefore Henry's main object to show that the motive alleged for this, as all then admitted, extreme exercise of the dispensing power, was a mere pretext and in itself quite disproportionate to the gravity of the case.

It would not, I think, serve any useful purpose to heap up references to the canonists by way of showing the important part which the *causa praetensa* plays in all questions of the validity of a

[11] See, e.g., Virvesius, *De Matrimonio Regis Angliae*, Q. 3a, fo. 62 (Salamanca, 1530, October), and Loazes, *Tractatus super Matrimonio*, D. 3a (Oriolae, 1531, June). *Cf.* the document printed by Burnet (ed. Pocock), iv. 77.

dispensation ;[12] I will only point to the fact that the insufficiency of the motive, namely, the cementing of the peace between the royal families of England and Spain, is everywhere put in the forefront of the king's objections against the dispensation bull of Julius. But now when we study the wording of the brief we notice that this motive no longer stands alone. The dispensation is solicited for the sake of peace '*and for certain other reasons*,' and this clause '*and for other reasons which weigh with us*' is also repeated in that passage of the brief in which the formal concession of the dispensation is made. Moreover, secondly, the motive of the cementing of the peace is much less absolutely stated in the brief. We might say that according to the wording of the *bull* the dispensation is granted because the pope was informed that such a marriage was necessary to maintain peace between the two countries. To which the obvious retort could be made that the marriage was not necessary for his purpose ; for the two countries were already at peace and at that period nothing threatened the good understanding between them. Pope Julius, it might be argued, was therefore misinformed and his dispensation was obreptitious. In the *brief*, on the other hand, it is only said that the existing friendly relations 'would *probably* not last so firmly' (*ita firmiter verisimiliter non perduraret*) unless a new marriage contract were entered upon. This was a proposition which could hardly be disputed, and there was consequently no ground to pretend that the brief was vitiated by subreption or obreption. Furthermore it will be noted that the *de certis aliis causis* clause cut at the root of some of the other objections. Although Henry may have been too young to understand fully the political need of peace with Spain,[13] he was not too young to wish to marry his brother's widow for 'certain other reasons'—for instance, from obedience to the express desire of his

[12] As a specimen of many similar utterances I may refer to an *obiter dictum* of Previdelli, *Consilium pro Rege Angliae* (Bologna, 1531), who remarks: 'Ioannes Andreas in dicto capite *Per venerabilem*, in fine, voluit quod papa potest in gradibus divina lege prohibitis dispensare *ex causa*; et abbas [i.e. N. de Tudeschis) in dicto capite *Per venerabilem*, quod audivit dici agitatum fuisse in curia an papa posset dispensare quod patruus ducat in uxorem neptem, et subjicit quod putat dispensationem talem fieri non posse nisi ex maxima et ardua causa: quam arduam et maximam causam cum Christiano dico non posse reperiri.' This very point is touched upon in the decrees of the council of Trent in this form: 'In secundo gradu nunquam dispensatur nisi inter magnos principes et ob publicam causam' (Sess. 24, 'De Mat.' c. 5). So again, speaking of another class of papal dispensation, the famous medieval canonist Archidiaconus (Guido de Baysio) lays down (in cap. *Sunt quidam*, xxv. q. 1) that 'pro magna guerra sopienda, aut pro cultu Dei ampliando, aut pro vitanda strage animarum,' the pope may allow a nun to marry, dispensing her from her solemn vow of chastity. But he holds that a less momentous reason would not suffice.

[13] See the argument as urged on the king's side, Burnet (ed. Pocock), iv. 77: '*Cupere* quidem affectus est, ceterum cupere contrahere matrimonium ad hoc ut pacis federa continuarentur, iudicii est et discretionis.'

father. Similarly, though the motive of maintaining peace between Henry VII and Isabella should be held to be technically vitiated by the death of either or both of the parties named, the 'certain other reasons' might still hold good and afford valid ground for a dispensation. At any rate here was an addition which necessitated an entire change of front on the part of the king's legal advisers, if the brief was to be contested and set aside to the satisfaction of an expert jurist like Campeggio. Even Wolsey, if I judge him rightly, had too much respect for the forms of law not to appreciate the fact that the production of the brief had completely altered the situation. It probably seemed to him that the more expeditious course was to attack the authenticity of the document, rather than to attempt to prove it legally ineffective. But the brief being in Spain, and Charles refusing to surrender it, nothing was gained in the end by the bullying policy which the king and his minister adopted.

The conclusions regarding the real significance of the brief, which I have here attempted to expound, had already been arrived at, and in part written down, when I noticed a passage in one of the documents printed by Dr. Ehses, which seems to me to set the question practically at rest. The piece referred to is a sort of summary of the divorce negotiations and justification of the pope, apparently addressed to Clement by one of his consultors on the occasion of Henry VIII's last letter, dated 13 July, 1530. After describing the various appeals made by the English ambassadors in Rome, and the eventual sending of Campeggio to England at Henry's own request, the writer continues—

> Successive, cum in Anglia regina ostenderet copiam brevis obtentae dispensationis, cum dicta, *et ex aliis causis animum nostrum moventibus* . . . quae non est in autentico penes regem existenti, missi sunt a rege ad Sanctitatem Vestram oratores Dr. Stephanus (Gardiner) et Petrus Vanni et Dr. Brianus, ut Sanctitas Vestra breve illud falsum pronuntiaret; quod negatum fuit, quia iustum non erat, quod illud, de quo non apparebat nisi per copiam, ac parte non citata nec audita, falsum pronuntiaretur.[14]

It is evident, I think, that the writer of this memorial considered that the significant part of the brief, as contrasted with the bull, consisted in the words *et ex aliis causis animum nostrum moventibus*. It was the insertion of this clause and not the omission of the word *forsan* which was associated in his memory with the discussions of that time. Is it too much to infer that it was this same short but pregnant phrase which had disconcerted the carefully prepared plans of Wolsey and brought the whole progress of the divorce to a temporary standstill?

HERBERT THURSTON.

[14] Ehses, *Römische Dokumente*, p. 157.

Greece under the Turks, 1571–1684

ONE result of the battle of Lepanto was to turn the attention of civilised Europe to Greece. Four years after the victory we find Athens 'rediscovered' by the curiosity of Martin Kraus—or Crusius, as he styled himself—a professor at Tübingen, who wrote for information about the celebrated city to Theodósios Zygomalâs, a Greek born at Nauplia but living at Constantinople. Zygomalâs had often visited Athens, which the frequent wars in the Levant, the depredations of corsairs, and the fact that the usual pilgrims' route to Palestine lay far to the south had so completely isolated from Europe that the densest ignorance prevailed about it in the west. He mentions in his reply the melody of the Athenian songs, which 'charmed those who heard them, as though they were the music of sirens,' the salubrity of the air, the excellence of the water, the good memories and euphonious voices of the inhabitants, among whom, as he states elsewhere, there then were 'about 160 bishops and priests.' At the same time he remarks of the language then spoken at Athens that 'if you heard the Athenians talk your eyes would fill with tears.' Another Greek, Simeon Kabásilas of Arta, informed Kraus that of all the seventy odd dialects of Greece the Attic of that day was the worst. The Greek and 'Ishmaelite,' or Turkish, populations lived, he wrote, in separate quarters of the town, which contained '12,000 male inhabitants.'[1] We learn too, from a short account of Athens discovered in the National Library at Paris in 1862, and composed in Greek in the sixteenth century,[2] that the Tower of the Winds was then a *tekkeh* of dervishes, and the mosque in the Parthenon was called Ismaïdi.

In spite of the depreciatory remarks on the culture of the sixteenth-century Athenians which Kraus permitted himself to make on the strength of his second-hand investigations, learning was even in that age not quite extinct in its ancient home. It was then that there flourished at Athens an accomplished nun, Philothée

[1] Crusius, *Turco-Graecia*, vii. 10, 19; Laborde, *Athènes aux XV^e, XVI^e, XVII^e Siècles*, i. 55–60.

[2] It is headed Περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς and has last been published and annotated by my friend K. Philadelpheús, in his excellent Ἱστορία τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἐπὶ Τουρκοκρατίας, i. 189–92. He assigns to it the date 1628.

Benizélou, afterwards included, for her piety and charitable foundations, among those whom the Greek church calls 'blessed,' and buried in the beautiful little Gorgoepékoos church. But, though she founded the Convent of St. Andrew on the site of what is now the chapel of the metropolitan of Athens, within whose walls she established the first girls' school of Turkish Athens, she has left a most uncomplimentary description of the Athenians of her day, with whom she had some pecuniary difficulties and upon whom she showers a string of abusive epithets in the best classical style.[3] Two other religious foundations also mark this period—that of the Church of the Archangels in 1577 in the Stoa of Hadrian, where an inscription still commemorates it, and that of the Monastery of Pentéle, built in the following year by Timótheos, archbishop of Euboea, whose skull, set in jewels, may still be seen there. The monks of Pentéle had to send 3,000 *okes* of honey every year to the great mosques of Constantinople.[4] We may infer from these facts that the Turkish authority sat lightly upon a town which was allowed the rare privilege of erecting new places of worship. The idea too then current in the west that Athens had been entirely destroyed, and that its site was occupied by a few huts, was obviously as absurd as the sketches of the city in the form of a Flemish or German town which were made in the fifteenth century. A place of '12,000 men' was not to be despised; and, if we may accept the statement of Kabásilas,[5] the male population of the Athens of 1578 was twice as large as the whole population of the Athens which Otho made his capital in 1834. It has sometimes been supposed, in accordance with the local tradition, that the city was placed, immediately after the Turkish conquest, under the authority of the chief eunuch at Constantinople; but it has now been shown that that arrangement was introduced much later. From the Turkish conquest to the capture of Euboea from the Venetians in 1470 Athens was the seat of a pasha, and capital of the first of the five *sandjaks*, or provinces, into which the conqueror divided continental Greece. In that year the seat of the pasha was transferred to Chalkís, which then became the capital of the *sandjak* of the Eúripos, of which Athens sank to be a district, or *caza*. In this position of dependence the once famous city continued till about the year 1610, being administered by a subordinate of the Euboean pasha,[6] who

[3] Philadelpheús, i. 202–8; Konstantinides, *Ἱστορία τῶν Ἀθηνῶν* (ed. 2), pp. 447–450.

[4] Kampoúroglos, *Μνημεῖα τῆς Ἱστορίας τῶν Ἀθηναίων* (ed. 2), i. 191, 336.

[5] Konstantinides thinks his figures much too high (*op. cit.* 442–7).

[6] Kampoúroglos, *Ἱστορία τῶν Ἀθηναίων*, ii. 77–83. Konstantinides (pp. 421–2) relying on a statement of Sanuto that the governor of Athens, even before 1470, was styled only *σουμπάσης*, thinks that all the time down to 1610 Athens was merely a district of a *sandjak*. Philadelpheús (i. 287–90) agrees with the latter view, but extends the duration of this arrangement to 1621 or even later.

every year paid it a much-dreaded visit of inspection, which, like most Turkish official visits, was very expensive to the hosts.

From the conclusion of the war of Cyprus in 1573 to the outbreak of the Cretan war in 1645 there was peace between Venice and the Turks, so that Greece ceased for over seventy years to be the battle-ground of those ancient foes. But spasmodic risings still occurred even during that comparatively quiet period. Thus, in 1585, a famous *armatolós*, Theodore Búa Grívas, raised the standard of revolt in the mountainous districts of Akarnanía and Epiros, at the instigation of the Venetians. His example was followed by two other *armatoloí*, Drákos and Malámos, who took Arta and marched on Joánnina. But this insurrection was speedily suppressed by the superior forces of the Turks, and Grívas, badly wounded, was fain to escape to the Venetian island of Itháke, where he died of his injuries.[7] Somewhat later, in 1611, Dionýsios, archbishop of Tríkkala, made a further attempt on Joánnina; but he was betrayed by the Jews, then, as ever, on the Turkish side, and flayed alive. His skin, stuffed with straw, was sent to Constantinople. Another Thessalian archbishop, accused of complicity with him, was offered the choice of apostasy or death, and manfully chose the latter, a choice which has given him a place in the martyrology of modern Greece.[8]

The greatest disturbance to the pacific development of the country arose, however, from the corsairs, who descended upon its coasts almost without intermission from the date of the Turkish conquest to the latter part of the seventeenth century. The damage inflicted by these pirates, who belonged to the Christian no less than to the Mussulman religion, and who made no distinction between the creeds of their victims, led the Greeks to dwell at a distance from the seaboard, in places that were not easily accessible; and thus the coast acquired that deserted look which it has not wholly lost even now.[9] The worst of these wretches were the Uscocs of Dalmatia, whose inhuman cruelties have rarely been surpassed. Sometimes they would eat the hearts of their victims; sometimes they would chain the crew below the deck, and then leave the captured vessel adrift, and its inmates to die of starvation, on the blue Ionian or the stormy Adriatic sea. In addition to the common pirates there were organised freebooters of higher rank, such as the Knights of Santo Stefano, founded by Cosmo de' Medici in 1560, and the Knights of Malta. The former were convenient auxiliaries of the Florentine fleet, because their exploits could be disowned by the government if unsuccessful. Towards the close of the sixteenth century the Florentines were able to occupy Chios for a moment; but

[7] Sáthas, Τουρκοκρατουμένη Ἑλλάς, pp. 178–9.

[8] See the Greek history of Epiros given in Pouqueville, *Voyage dans la Grèce*, v. 82–90.

[9] Finlay, *History of Greece*, v. 57, 90–1, 94, 96, 101, 108.

the Turks soon regained possession of that rich island, and visited the sins of the Tuscans upon the inhabitants whom they had come to deliver. Years afterwards a traveller saw a row of grim skulls on the battlements of the fort, and the descendants of the Genoese settlers, who had hitherto received specially favourable treatment from the sultan, were so badly treated that they mostly emigrated.[10] In emulation of the Knights of Santo Stefano those of Malta in 1603 sacked Patras, which had been burned by a Spanish squadron only eight years before, and occupied Naúpaktos, which in the seventeenth century bore the ominous nickname of 'Little Algiers,' from the pirates of Algiers and Tripoli who made it their head-quarters. When, in 1676, the traveller Spon visited it, he found a number of Moors settled down there with their coal-black progeny.[11] A few years later the Maltese, baffled in an attempt on Navarino, retaliated on Corinth, whence they carried off 500 captives. Finally in 1620 they assailed the famous Frankish castle of Glárentza, in the strong walls of which their bombs opened a breach; but the approach of a considerable Turkish force compelled them to return to their ships, after having attained no other result than that of having injured one of the most interesting medieval monuments in Greece. Another Frankish stronghold, that of Passavâ, was surprised by the Spaniards when they ravaged Maina in 1601. The co-operation of that restive population with the invaders, whose predatory tastes they shared, led the Porte to adopt strong measures against the Mainates, who in 1614 were, in name at least, reduced to submission and compelled to pay tribute.[12] But though the capitan pasha was thus able to starve Maina into submission he could not protect the Greeks against the pirates, who so long preyed upon their commerce, burnt their villages, debauched their women, and desolated their land. Had Turkey been a strong maritime power, able to sweep piracy from the seas, Greece would have been spared much suffering and would have had less damage to repair.

It was at this time too that the classic land of the arts began to suffer from another form of depredation, that of the cultured collector. To a British nobleman belongs the discredit of this revival of the work of Nero. About 1613 the earl of Arundel was seized with the idea of 'transplanting old Greece into England.' With this object he commissioned political agents, merchants, and others, chief among them William Petty, uncle of the well-known political economist, to scour the Levant in quest of statues. His example speedily found imitators, such as the duke of Buckingham and King Charles I, who charged the English admiral in the Levant, Sir Kenelm Digby, with the duty of collecting works of art for the

[10] Dapper, *Description des Iles de l'Archipel*, p. 224.
[11] Spon, *Voyage*, ii. 23 (ed. 1679). [12] Finlay, v. 108, 114.

royal palace. Needless to say the rude sailors who were ordered to remove the precious pieces of marble often mutilated what they could not remove intact. They sawed in two a statue of Apollo at Dêlos, and they might have anticipated the achievements of Lord Elgin at Athens had not its distance from the sea and the suspicions of the Turkish garrison on the Akropolis saved it from the fate to which the Cyclades were exposed.[13]

While the corsairs were devastating Greece a picturesque adventurer, who recalls the abortive scheme of Charles VIII of France, was engaged in planning her deliverance. Charles Gonzaga, duc de Nevers, boasted of his connexion with the imperial house of the Palaiológoi through his grandmother, Margaret of Montferrat, a descendant of the emperor Andrónikos Palaiológos the Elder.[14] After having fought against the Turks in Hungary he conceived the romantic idea of claiming the throne of Constantinople, with which object he visited various European courts, and about 1612 entered into negotiations with the Greeks. His schemes received a willing hearing from the restless Mainates, who sent three high ecclesiastics to assure him of their readiness to recognise him as their liege lord if he would send them a body of experienced officers to organise a force of 10,000 Greeks. They even promised to become Roman catholics, and arranged, on paper, for the division of the Turkish lands among themselves, and for the confiscation of all Jewish property in order to defray the expenses of the expedition. The pretender, on his part, sent three trusty agents to spy out the land and make plans of the Turkish positions; they came back with most hopeful accounts of the enthusiasm of the Mainates, who were only waiting for the favourable moment to raise the two-headed eagle on the walls of Mistrâ. Neóphytos, the bishop of Maina, and Chrýsanthos Láskaris, the metropolitan of Lakedaimon, whose tomb may still be seen in one of the churches at Mistrâ, addressed him as Constantine Palaiológos, and told him to hasten his coming among his faithful people, who in proof of their submission sent him some falcons.

But the duc de Nevers wasted in diplomacy time which should have been devoted to prompt action. He appealed to Pope Paul V, the grand duke of Tuscany, the king of Spain, and the emperor, who were all profuse in promises and some of whom furnished him with ships and money. An attempt was also made to stir up the other Christian nationalities of the East, and a meeting of Albanian, Bosnian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Servian leaders was held for the purpose of concerted action, while the two *hospodars* of

[13] Laborde, i. 67–70. An Austrian archæologist has suggested that the recently discovered Hermes, Paris, or Perseus, of Antikýthera, now at Athens, was part of the spoil of a vessel bound for England which foundered in 1640 off that island.

[14] His genealogy is given in Sáthas, Τουρκοκρατουμένη Ἑλλάς, p. 197, n. 2.

Moldavia and Wallachia promised their aid. Another adventurer, who styled himself Sultan Zachiâs and gave out that he was a brother of the sultan Ahmed I, was admitted as an ally. Finally, in order to give a religious character to the movement, the duke founded and became chief of a body calling itself the 'Christian army,' commissions in which were offered to the conspirators, among whom we find the name of a learned Athenian, Leonárdos Philarâs,[15] who was patronised by Richelieu and to whom Milton addressed two letters. A date was fixed for the rising, and four memoranda were addressed to the duke, with full particulars of his future realm of Greece. From these we learn that in 1619 the Peloponnesos could furnish him with 15,000 fighting men, while it contained 8,000 Turks capable of bearing arms, of whom 800 formed the scanty garrisons of Koróne, Methóne, Navarino, and Nauplia. At that time, we are told, there were 800 Turkish military fiefs in the Morea, and the population of Maina was estimated at 4,913 families, spread over 125 villages and hamlets. These statistics are the most valuable result of the agitation.

After several years of correspondence and negotiation the pretender at last managed to equip five vessels for the transport of his crusaders; but a sudden fire, perhaps the work of an incendiary, laid them in ashes, and the jealousy of Spain and Venice prevented any effective political action. The 'Christian army' still went on meeting and discussing its plan of campaign, and two more strange adventurers—a Moor who had become a Christian and styled himself 'infant of Fez,' and a Greek who, with even greater ambition, had adopted the title of 'prince of Macedonia'—became the principal agents of the duke. At last, however, every one grew weary of his absurd pretensions, and the secession of the pope from his side finally destroyed his hopes.[16]

During the Cretan war between Venice and the Turks two risings were promoted by the Venetians in Greece for the purpose of diverting the attention of their enemies. In 1647 the Venetian admiral Grimani, after chasing the Turkish fleet to Euboea and Volo, blockaded it within the harbour of Nauplia. At this the Albanians of the Peloponnesos, who were very favourable to the republic, rose against the Turks, and after having done a considerable amount of damage to Turkish property escaped punishment by fleeing on board the Venetian squadron. A Greek, more daring but less fortunate, conceived the idea of setting fire to the Turkish vessels as they lay in harbour, but paid for his audacity with his life.[17] In 1659 the Mainates, who had availed themselves of the war to throw off every shadow of subjection to the sultan, but who plundered Venetian and Turkish ships with equal impar-

[15] Sáthas, p. 209. [16] *Ibid.* pp. 197–210.
[17] Nani, *Istoria della R. Veneta*, pt. ii. p. 134.

tiality, were induced by the great Francesco Morosini to devote their abilities to the plunder of the Morea. At that time piracy was the principal profession of the Mainate population, who sold Christians to Turks and Turks to Christians. Priests and monks, we are told, joined in the business, and the fact that they lived in caves overlooking the sea made them valuable auxiliaries of the pirates, whom they informed of the approach of passing vessels. Some of them even embarked on board the pirate schooners, for the purpose of levying the tithe which was allotted by the pious freebooters to the church.[18] These schooners sometimes sailed out among the Cyclades, and just as Naúpaktos was nicknamed 'Little Algiers' so Oítylos in Maina was called 'Great Algiers.' Well acquainted with the influence of the church in eastern politics, Morosini worked upon the feelings of the Mainates by taking with him the deposed oecumenical patriarch, then living on the island of Síphnos. The pirates of Maina humbly kissed the hand of the eminent ecclesiastic, and 10,000 of them, with 3,000 Greeks and Albanians, assisted the Venetian commander in an attack upon Kalamata, which was abandoned by its Mussulman and Christian inhabitants alike to its rapacious assailants. The Cretan poet Bounialês has left a graphic account of their proceedings in his poem on the Cretan war.

But no strategic result accrued from the sack of Kalamata; Morosini sailed off to the Aegean, advising the Mainates to reserve their energies for a more favourable opportunity of conquering the Peloponnesos. The auxiliaries of the Venetian commander, pending that event, continued to prey upon Turkish vessels, and even attacked the fleet of the grand vizier, Achmet Kiupruli, which was then engaged in the siege of Candia. The offer of double the pay of his own soldiers could not bribe the Mainates to desist from their at once patriotic and profitable piracies. Baffled by their refusal, the grand vizier ordered Hasân-Babâ, a pirate of renown and accounted the best seaman in the Turkish fleet, to reduce Maina to submission. But the women of Maina sufficed to strike terror into the heart of the bold Hasân. 'Tell my husband,' said one of them, 'to mind the goat and hold the child, and I will go and find his weapons and use them better than he.' At the head of the population the women marched down to the shore, and the Turkish captain thought it wiser to remain on board. But in the evening experienced swimmers cut the cables of his ships, two of which were driven upon the rocks of that iron

[18] Randolph, *The Present State of the Morea*, p. 9; Guillet, *Athènes Ancienne et Nouvelle*, pp. 28–38. It must be added, however, that the Capuchins of Athens, upon whose notes this book was based, may from theological bias have exaggerated the misdeeds of the orthodox clergy. On this ground the local historian, Alexandrákos, in his *Ἱστορία τῆς Μάνης*, p. 18, indignantly rejects these accusations. But in 1894 I heard in Athens a similar story about a Thessalian priest, implicated in a celebrated case of brigandage.

coast and became the prey of the wreckers, while Hasân was glad to escape on his sole surviving vessel.

Unable to subdue the Mainates by force, the grand vizier now had recourse to diplomacy. The hereditary blood feud had long been the curse of Maina, and its inhabitants were divided into the hostile factions of the Stephanópouloi and the Iatraíoi—the Montagues and Capulets of that rugged land. At that time there was in Maina a certain Liberákes Gerakáres, who, after an apprenticeship in the Venetian fleet, had turned his nautical experience to practical use as a pirate. In an interval of his profession he had become engaged to a daughter of the clan of Iatraíoi, who boasted of their descent from one of the Florentine Medici, formerly shipwrecked there; but, before the wedding had taken place, a rival, belonging to the opposite clan, eloped with the lady. Smarting under his loss and burning for revenge upon the whole race of the Stephanópouloi, the disappointed lover was accidentally captured by the Turks at sea and carried off to prison. The crafty Kiupruli saw at once that Liberákes was the very man for his purpose. He not only released him, but provided him with money, and sent him back to Maina in the capacity of his secret agent. Liberákes at once distributed the pasha's gold among his clansmen and proclaimed civil war against the Stephanópouloi. At the same time the Mainates were told of favours which the grand vizier had in store for them—the use of bells and crosses outside their churches, the abolition of the tribute of children, and the remission of half the capitation tax. No Turk, it was added, should live among them.

As soon as Crete had fallen Kiupruli devoted his attention to the accomplishment of his plan. He peremptorily summoned the Mainates, under penalty of extermination, to submit to his authority, promising them an amnesty and the remission of all arrears of tribute in case of prompt submission. At the same time he despatched 6,000 men to Maina, with orders to treat the people well, but to build, under the pretext of protecting trade, three forts in strong positions. As soon, however, as the forts were finished, Liberákes and his men seized some of their most prominent foes, while the Turks preserved an air of complete indifference. After a mock trial the unfortunate Stephanópouloi were sentenced to death as disturbers of the public peace. Those of them who escaped emigrated to Corsica, where their descendants may still be found at Cargèse. More than a century later they furnished to Bonaparte agents for the dissemination of his plans of conquest in Greece. Other Mainates went into exile in Tuscany, where their descendants soon became fused with the Italian population, and in Apulia, while those who remained behind were for the second time placed under Turkish authority. Liberákes, as

soon as his deluded countrymen had realised the device of which they had been the victims, became so unpopular that he took to piracy again. A second time captured by the Turks, he was again imprisoned till his captors once more found need for his services.[19]

While Candia was the scene of the great struggle between Venice and 'the Ottomite,' Athens was once more coming within the ken of Europe. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the French showed much activity in the Levant, where they established consuls about that time. In 1630 the French ambassador at Constantinople, Louis des Hayes, had visited Athens,[20] of which a brief mention is made in his travels, and in 1645 a very important step towards the 'rediscovery' of the famous city was taken. In that year a body of Jesuit missionaries were sent thither, and though they subsequently removed to Negroponte, because that place contained more Franks, they were followed at Athens in 1658 by the Capuchins, whose name will ever be remembered in connexion with the topography of that city. In 1669 they bought the choragic monument of Lysikrates, then colloquially known as 'the Lantern of Demosthenes,' which henceforth formed part of their convent.[21] Over the entrance they placed the lilies of France, to which the monument still belongs, and by whose care it has twice been restored; but their hospitality was extended to strangers of all races and religions, and it is curious to hear that the Turkish *cadi* would only sanction this purchase of a national monument on condition that the Capuchins promised not to injure it and to show it to all who wished to see it. The monument itself was converted into a study, where Lord Byron passed many an hour during his visit to Athens in 1811, and where he wrote his famous indictment of Lord Elgin's vandalism. The chapel of the convent was, till the capture of the city by Morosini, the only Frankish place of worship. But the worthy Capuchins did not confine themselves to religious exercises. About the same time that they purchased the choragic monument they drew up a plan of Athens, which was a great advance on the imaginary representations of that place, which had hitherto been devised to gratify the curiosity of Europe, and which had depicted Athens now as a Flemish and now as a German town. Nor did they keep their information to themselves. They communicated their plan and a quantity of notes to a French literary man, Guillet, who published them in the form of an imaginary journey, supposed to have been undertaken by his brother, La Guilletière. The sources of Guillet's information render his narrative far more valuable than if he had

[19] Finlay, v. 116–7; Spon, i. 123; Sáthas, pp. 308–10; Paparregópoulos, Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους, v. 493; Leake, *Travels in the Morea*, iii. 450.

[20] Laborde, i. 63; Philadelpheús (i. 184, 187) puts his visit in 1621. The passage about Athens is in his *Voyage de Levant* (ed. 1645), pp. 473–5.

[21] Laborde, i. 75, 201; Guillet, p. 223.

merely paid a flying visit to Athens; and though he never saw the place about which he wrote he had at his command the best available materials, compiled by men who had lived there. About the same time Babin, a Jesuit who had also lived at Athens, drew up an account of it, which was published by Dr. Spon,[22] a physician and antiquary of Lyons, who visited Greece in 1675 and 1676 in the company of an Englishman, Sir George Wheler, and subsequently issued a detailed account of his travels, upon which his travelling companion afterwards based an English version. Two other Englishmen, Randolph and Vernon, also travelled in Greece at different times between 1671 and 1679, and have left behind records of their impressions. Besides these unofficial travellers Lord Winchelsea, the British ambassador at Constantinople, paid a visit, of which, however, he published no record, to Athens in 1675, while the previous year had witnessed the tour of his French colleague, the marquis de Nointel, through the Cyclades and Attica, in the company of the painter Jacques Carrey, who drew for him the sculptures of the Parthenon, and of an Italian, Cornelio Magni, who wrote an account of the great man's journey.[23] Thus we have ample opportunities for judging what was the condition of Athens between the years 1669 and 1676, or shortly before the Venetian siege, while recent researches have greatly elucidated the statements of the travellers.

The population of Athens at that time is estimated by Guillet at between 15,000 and 16,000, of whom only 1,000 or 1,200 were Mussulmans, and by Spon at between 8,000 and 9,000, of whom three-quarters were Greeks and the rest Turks. A modern Greek scholar,[24] while accepting Spon's estimate of the proportion between the Greeks and the Mussulmans, puts the total population at the time of the Venetian siege at 20,000, which would better tally with the expression of a Hessian officer, Hombergk, who was among the besiegers, and who wrote home that Athens was 'a very big and populous town.' Another German officer, a Hanoverian, named Zehn, even went so far in his journal as to state that Athens had '14,000 houses,'[25] which must be an exaggeration. It is clear, however, from all these estimates that Athens was in 1687 a considerable place. Besides the Greeks and Turks there were also a few Franks, some gipsies, and a body of negroes. The negroes were the slaves of the Turks, living in winter at the foot of the Akropolis, in the holes of the rock, in huts, or among the ruins of old houses, and in summer, like the modern Athenians, spending

[22] His *Relation de l'Etat présent de la ville d'Athènes* is reprinted in full in Laborde's book.

[23] Laborde, i. 176; Finlay, v. 104, n. 2; Ray's *Collection of Curious Travels and Voyages*, vol. ii.; Randolph, *The Present State of the Morea;* Magni, *Relazione della città d' Atene.*

[24] Kampoúroglos, Ἱστορία, iii. 135.

[25] Laborde, ii. 358, 363.

their spare time on the beach at Pháleron. The gipsies were particularly odious to the Greeks as the tools of any Turk who wished to torture them. Among the Franks were the consuls, of whom there were two. At the time of Spon's visit they were both Frenchmen and both deadly enemies, M. Châtaignier, the representative of France, and M. Giraud, a resident in Athens for the last eighteen years, who acted for England and was the *cicerone* of all travellers. A little later, in the reign of James II, we were represented by one of our own countrymen, Launcelot Hobson, one of whose servants, a native of Limehouse, together with two other Englishmen, was buried at that time in the Church of St. Mary's-on-the-Rock beneath a tombstone, now in the north wall of the English church, commemorating his great linguistic attainments. Besides the two consuls Spon found no other Franks at Athens, except one Capuchin monk, one soldier, and some servants; a little earlier we hear of a German adventurer as living there.[26]

Our authorities differ as to the feelings with which at that period the Athenians regarded the Franks. Guillet, indeed, alludes to the excellent relations between the Greeks and Latins, and points, as a proof of it, to the remarkable fact that young Athenians were sent by their parents to be educated by the Capuchins. The consul Giraud's wife was also a Greek. Spon, however, speaks of the great aversion of the Greeks to the Franks,[27] and this is confirmed by an incident which followed the visit of the marquis de Nointel to Athens in 1674. During his stay the pious ambassador had had mass recited in the ancient temple of Triptólemos, beyond the Ilissós, which, under the title of St. Mary's-on-the-Rock, had served as a chapel of the Frank dukes.[28] After their time it had been converted into a Greek church, but had been allowed to fall into disuse. None the less it was considered by the orthodox to have been profaned by the masses of the French ambassador.[29] A great number of satirical verses have been also preserved,[30] which show that the Frank residents were the butt of every sharp-witted Athenian street boy, and their cleanly habits were especially suspicious to the orthodox. Besides, as many of the pirates were Franks, the popular logic readily confounded the two, and visited upon the harmless Latin the sins of some of his co-religionists. It was manifest, however, at the time of the Venetian siege that the Athenians preferred the Franks to the Turks, and every traveller from the west praised the hospitality

[26] Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter*, ii. 417 n.

[27] *Ubi supra*, ii. 187.

[28] There is a picture, taken from Stuart, of this Παναγία στὴν πέτρα in Kampoúroglos, Ἱστορία, ii. 280. See his Μνημεῖα, i. 93. It was destroyed by Hadji Ali, to provide materials for the defences of Athens against the Albanians in 1778.

[29] Laborde, i. 126 n.

[30] In the third volume of Kampoúroglos, Ἱστορία.

which the Greeks of Athens showed to the foreigner. Spon tells us that there was not a single Jew to be found in the city. Quite apart from the national hatred which they inspired, and still inspire, in the Hellenic breast, how could they outwit the Athenians?[31] Would they not have fared like their fellow countrymen who landed one day on Lesbos, but, on observing the astuteness of the Lesbian hucksters in the market-place, went off by the next ship, saying that this was no place for them? On the other hand a few Wallachs wandered about Athens, some Albanian Mussulmans were employed in guarding the entrances to the town, and in all the villages of Attica the inhabitants were of the Albanian race, as is still largely the case.[32] In Athens itself all the non-Turkish and non-Hellenic population did not amount at that time to more than 500.

A great change had taken place in the government of the city since the early years of the seventeenth century. We last saw Athens forming a district of the *sanâjak* of Eúripos, and dependent on the pasha of Euboea, who was represented there by a lower official. A document in the Bodleian Library,[33] dated 1617, gives us, from the pen of a Greek exile in England, an account of the exactions of a rapacious Turkish governor of Athens somewhat earlier. In consequence of this bad treatment the Athenians sent several deputations to Constantinople, and about the year 1610 the efforts of their delegates received strong support from one of those Athenian beauties who have from time to time exercised sway over the rulers of Constantinople. A young girl, named Basiliké, who had become the favourite wife of Sultan Ahmed I, had been requested by him to ask some favour for herself. The patriotic Athenian, who had heard in her childhood complaints of the exactions of the pasha of Eúripos and his deputy, and perhaps primed by one of the Athenian deputations which may then have been at Constantinople, begged that her native city might be transferred to the *kislar-aga*, or chief of the black eunuchs in the seraglio. The request was granted, and thenceforth Athens, greatly to its material benefit, depended upon that powerful official.[34] A *firman*, renewable on the accession of a new sultan, spared the citizens the annual visitation of the pasha of Eúripos, who could only descend upon them when the issue of the precious document was delayed. The *kislar-aga* was represented at Athens by a *voivode*, or governor, and the other Turkish officials were the *disdar-aga*, or commander of the garrison

[31] Spon, ii. 180. Even now there is no synagogue in Athens.

[32] *E.g.* the thief who pillaged the king's study at Tatoi in 1902 was an Albanian from Markópoulo, between Athens and Lávrion. Many of the names of the Attic villages—*e.g.* Tatoï, Liósia, and Liópesi—are Albanian.

[33] Printed by Kampoúroglos, Μνημεῖα, ii. 238–43.

[34] Guillet, who tells the story, upon which Spon casts doubt, places this under Ahmed I. Spon says the boon was granted about 1645.

in the Akropolis, which shortly before the Venetian war amounted to 300 soldiers; the *sardar* and the *spahilar-aga*, who directed the janissaries and the cavalry; the *cadi*; and the *mufti*.

The Athenians enjoyed, however, under this Turkish administration an almost complete system of local self-government. Unlike the democratic Greece of to-day, where there is no aristocracy and where every man considers himself the equal of his fellows, Turkish Athens exhibited sharp class distinctions, which had at least the advantage of furnishing a set of rulers who had the respect of the ruled. Under the Turks the Greek population of the town was divided into four classes—the *árchontes*; the householders, who lived on their property; the shopkeepers, organised, as now, in different guilds; and the cultivators of the lands or gardens in the immediate suburbs, who also included in their ranks those engaged in the important business of bee-keeping.[35] The first of these four classes, into which members of the other three never rose, had originally consisted of twelve families, representing —so the tradition stated—the twelve ancient tribes of the fourth century before Christ. Their number subsequently varied, but about this period amounted to rather more than sixty. Among their names it is interesting to find, though no longer in the very first rank, the family (which still exists at Athens) of the Athenian historian Chalkokondýles, slightly disguised under the form Charkondýles. More important were the Benizéloi, whose name is still prominent alike in Greek and Cretan politics, and the Palaiológoi, who boasted, without much genealogical proof, of their connexion with the famous imperial family. Some of the *árchontes* went so far as to use the Byzantine double eagle on their tombs, of which a specimen may still be seen in the monastery of Kaisariané, and all wore a peculiar costume, of which a fur cap was in later Turkish times a distinctive mark. Their flowing locks and long beards gave them the majestic appearance of Greek ecclesiastics, and the great name of Alexander was allowed to be borne by them alone. This Athenian aristocracy is now all but extinct; yet the names of localities round Athens still preserve the memory of these once important families, and in Mount Skaramangâ, near Salamis, and in Pikérmi, on the road to Marathon, we may trace the property of *árchontes*, who once owned those places, while in modern Athens the names of streets commemorate the three great families of Chalkokondýles, Benizélos, and Límponas.

From this class of some sixty families the Christian administrators of Athens were selected. Once a year, on the last Sunday in February, all the citizens who paid taxes assembled outside St. Panteleémon, which was in Turkish times the metropolitan church, after a solemn service inside; the principal householders and

[35] Ἄρχοντες, νοικοκυραῖοι, παζαρῖται, ξωτάσηδες

tradesmen and the heads of the guilds then exchanged their views, and elected from the whole body of *árchontes* the chief officials for the ensuing year, the so-called δημογέροντες, or 'elders of the people.' There is some difference of opinion as to their numbers, which have been variously estimated at two, three, four, eight, and twenty-four. A recent Greek scholar has, however, shown from the evidence of documents that they were three.[36] After their election had been ratified by the *cadi* they entered upon the duties of their office, which practically constituted an *imperium in imperio*. They represented the Greek population before the Turkish authorities, watched over the privileges of the city, looked after the schools and the poor, cared for the widows and the orphans, and decided every Monday, under the presidency of the metropolitan, such differences between the Greeks as the litigants did not prefer to submit to the *cadi*. Their decision was almost always sought by their fellow Christians; and even in mixed cases, which came before the Turkish judge, they acted as the counsel of the Greek party. They had the first seats everywhere; they were allotted a special place in the churches, and when they passed the people rose to their feet. Each of them received for his trouble 1,000 piastres during his year of office, and they were entitled to levy a tax upon salt for the expenses of the community. They sometimes combined the usual vices of slaves with those of tyrants, fawning on the Turkish officials and frowning on the Greek populace. But they often had the courage to impeach the administration of some harsh governor at Constantinople, and, like the rest of the class from which they sprang, they sometimes made sacrifices of blood and treasure for their native city. In addition to these 'elders' there were eight other officials of less age and dignity, called 'agents,' or ἐπίτροποι, and elected from each of the eight parishes into which Athens was then divided. These persons, who were chosen exclusively from the class of *árchontes*, acted as go-betweens between the latter and the Turkish authorities.

Thus the English traveller Randolph was justified in asserting that 'the Greeks live much better here than in any other part of Turkey, with the exception of Scio, being a small commonwealth among themselves;'[37] or, as a modern writer has said of his countrymen, 'the Athenians did not always feel the yoke of slavery heavy.'[38] The taxes were not oppressive, consisting of the *haratch*, or capitation tax, which in Spon's time was at the rate of five instead of four and a half piastres a head, and of a tithe, both of which went to the *voivode*, who in turn had to pay 30,000 crowns to the chief eunuch. There was also the terrible tribute of children,

[36] Kampoúroglos, Ἱστορία, ii. 102.

[37] *The Present State of the Morea*, p. 22.

[38] Kampoúroglos, Ἱστορία, iii. 120.

from which Athens was not exempt, as has sometimes been supposed, for the Lincoln College manuscript, which had belonged to Sir George Wheler and was first published by Professor Lámpros, expressly mentions the arrival of the men to take them.[39] But on the whole the condition of the Athenians, owing to the influence of their powerful protector at Constantinople, was very tolerable. When some of the principal Turkish officials of Athens meditated the imposition of a new duty on Athenian merchandise, two local merchants were sent to the then chief eunuch, with the result that they obtained from him the punishment of their oppressors.[40] When the oecumenical patriarch ordered the deposition of their metropolitan, the Athenians persuaded the *Kislar-Aga* to get the order quashed.[41] We do not know whether they felt with Gibbon that this august patronage 'aggravated their shame,' but it certainly 'alleviated their servitude.' At times, however, even the long arm of the chief eunuch could not protect them from the vengeance of the enemies whom they had denounced to him. Thus in 1678 the local Turks murdered Michael Límponas, the most prominent citizen of Athens, who had just returned from a successful mission, in which he had complained of their misdeeds at Constantinople. A Cretan poet celebrated his death for his country, and this *árchon* of the seventeenth century may truly be included among the martyrs of Greece.[42] It was noticed that, even in that age, the old Athenian love of liberty had not been extinguished by more than four centuries of Frankish and Turkish rule; the Attic air, it was said, still made those who breathed it intolerant of authority. Babin remarked that the Athenians had 'a great opinion of themselves,' and that 'if they had their liberty they would be just as they are described by St. Paul in the Acts.'[43] Athens, he wrote, still possessed persons of courage and virtue, such as the girl who received sixty blows of a knife rather than lose her honour, and the child who died rather than apostatise.

The Athenians were very religious under the Turkish sway, and then, as now, there were frequent pilgrimages to the Holy Land.[44] Sometimes this religious feeling was prone to degenerate into superstition; for example, Greeks and Turks alike believed that various epidemics lay buried beneath the great marble columns of the ruined temples. In short, the Athenian character was much what it might have been expected to be. Industrious, musical, and hospitable the Greeks of Athens were admitted to be, and the virtue of the Athenian ladies was no less admired than their good

[39] Ἐπῆραν τὰ παιδιὰ ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀθήνα [*sic*] are the words. This chronicle, which is dated 1606, has been republished by Kampoúroglos in his Μνημεῖα, i. 89–90.

[40] Spon, ii. 103.

[41] Kampoúroglos, Μνημεῖα, i. 33; Paparregópoulos, v. 597.

[42] The θρῆνος for him is published in Kampoúroglos, Μνημεῖα, i. 7–27.

[43] Laborde, i. 208.

[44] Kampoúroglos, Ἱστορία, ii. 174.

looks. But the satirical talents of Aristophanes had descended to the Athenians of the seventeenth century; no one could escape from the barbed arrows of their caustic wit, sometimes poisoned with the spirit of envy; they ridiculed Turks, and Franks, and Wallachs, and their own fellow-countrymen alike, and they delighted in inflicting nicknames which stuck to their unhappy object. Their love of money and astuteness in business may have given rise to the current saying, 'From the Jews of Thessalonika, the Turks of Negropont, and the Greeks of Athens, good Lord, deliver us.' In striking contrast to the proverbial Turks of Euboea, those resident in Athens were usually amiable.[45] They generally agreed well with their Greek neighbours, whose language they spoke very well. In fact, like the Cretan Mussulmans of to-day, they knew only a few words of Turkish, barely sufficient for their religious devotions, while some of the Greeks were acquainted with the latter language. Sometimes the Turkish residents would aid the Greeks to get rid of an unpopular governor; and, when Easter and Bairam coincided, they would take a fraternal interest in each other's festivals. The Athenian Moslem drank wine, like his Christian fellow, and his zeal for water and his respect for trees were distinct benefits, the latter of which modern Athens has now lost. There was, however, one notable exception to the general amiability of the Turkish residents. The Greek population of Attica, as distinct from the town, was much oppressed by the Turkish landlords, and despised by the Greek townsfolk. One part of Athens, and that the holy of holies, the venerable Akropolis, was exclusively reserved to the Turks, and no *rayah* was allowed to enter it, not because of its artistic treasures, but because it was a fortress. Archæological researches there were regarded with grave suspicion.[46]

Education was not neglected by the Athenians of the seventeenth century. From 1614 to 1619 and again in 1645 a wayward Athenian genius, named Korydalleús, was teaching philosophy to a small class there. A Greek, resident in Venice, founded a school there in 1647, and in Spon's time there were three schoolmasters —among them Demétrios Benizélos, who had studied in Venetia— employed in giving lectures in rhetoric and philosophy, while many young Greeks went to the classes of the Capuchins. We hear of a Greek monk who was acquainted with Latin; but Spon could find only three people in Athens who understood ancient Greek.[47] A century earlier, as we saw, correspondents of Kraus had commented on the badness of the Attic Greek of their day. Yet, according to

[45] Kampoúroglos, Ἱστορία, iii. 120.

[46] Vernon, in Ray's *Collection of Curious Travels and Voyages*, ii. 22.

[47] pon, ii. 194; Paparregópoulos, v. 645. Philadelpheús has treated exhaustively of the Athenian schools in the Turkish period (ii. ch. xix.).

Guillet, it was by this time 'the purest and least corrupt idiom in Greece,' and 'Athenian phrases and a Nauplian accent' were commended as the perfection of Greek. Externally too Athens was no mere barbarous collection of huts. The houses were of stone, and better built than those of the Morea; and a picture which has been preserved [48] of an *árchon's* house of the later Turkish period, constructed round a court with trees and a fountain in the middle, shows the influence of Mussulman taste on the Athenian aristocracy. The solid construction of the houses, and the name of 'towers' (*πύργοι*) given to the country villas of the *árchontes*, as in the island of Andros to the present day, were both due to the prevalence of piracy, then the curse of Athens. But the streets were unpaved and narrow—an arrangement better adapted, however, to the fierce heat of an Attic summer than the wide thoroughfares of the modern Greek capital. The town was then divided into eight parishes, or *platómata*, the name of one of which, Pláka, survives, and contained no fewer than fifty-two churches and five mosques. Among the latter were the Parthenon, or 'Mosque of the Castle,' the minaret of which figures conspicuously in the contemporary plans, and the 'Mosque of the Conqueror,' now used as the military bakery, which had been converted from a church by Mohammed II.[49] The most important of the former was the metropolitan church, the *Καθολικόν*, as it was then called, usually identified with the small building which still bears that name, but supposed by Kampoúroglos to have been that of St. Panteleémon.[50] Although the clergy had less influence at Athens than in some other parts of Greece, the metropolitan, as we have seen, was a personage of political importance; he received at that time 4,000 crowns a year, and had under his jurisdiction the five bishops of Sálona, Livádia, Boudonítza, Atalánte, and Skýros. The Monastery of Kaisariané, or Syriané, on Hymettós, or 'Deli-Dagh' (the 'Mad Mountain'), as the Turks called it, still paid only one *sequin* to the *voivode* in consideration of the fact that its abbot had presented the keys of Athens to Mohammed II at the time of the conquest.[51] The catholic archbishopric of Athens had, however, ceased to exist on the death of the last archbishop in 1483, and the churches and

[48] In Kampoúroglos, *Ἱστορία*, vol. iii.

[49] Kampoúroglos (*Ἱστορία*, ii. 37) thinks that it had been the metropolitan church of Athens during the whole Frankish period. Philadelpheús (i. 178, 273, 312) agrees with him. When I visited it I could see not only that it had been a mosque, but that it might easily have been a church. There are old pillars inside it, a continuation of those in the Roman market outside.

[50] *Ἱστορία*, ii. 275, 304. Philadelpheús, i. 273. This identification is conclusively proved not only by tradition among very old Athenians, but by an entry in a Gospel found at Aegina with the words *τοῦ Καθολικοῦ τῆς Ἀθήνας τοῦ Ἁγίου Παντελεήμονος*. This church stood in the square where the public auctions are still held.

[51] Spon, ii. 155, 172. 'Deli Dagh' is a translation of 'Monte Matto,' the Italian version of Hymettós. Kampoúroglos, *Ἱστορία*, ii. 50.

monasteries which had belonged to it in Frankish days had been recovered by the orthodox Greeks.

Although the Ilissós even then, as now, contained very little water, there were a number of gardens along its banks above the town, with country houses at Ambeloképi, and the excellent air and its freedom from plague at that period made Athens a healthy residence, where doctors could not make a living.[52] There were still some rich merchants; but the trade of Athens was mainly limited to the agricultural produce of the neighbourhood, to the export of oil, and to a little silk, imported from other parts and woven in private houses. Randolph mentions that, in 1671, an inspector from Constantinople found about 50,000 olive trees in the plain, and some of the olives were esteemed so delicious that they were reserved for the sultan's table. The oil was excellent, and was exported every year to Marseilles. Athens also supplied cotton sail-cloth to the Turkish navy.[53] As for the wine, though good, it was voted undrinkable by all the travellers of that period, owing to the resin with which it was impregnated.[54] Honey was still as famous a product of Hymettós as in classic ages, and the monks of Kaisariané were specially renowned for their hives. Trade being thus small, it is not surprising that few Franks resided at Athens. Such as it was, it was entirely in Greek hands.

The monuments of Athens had not then suffered from the havoc so soon to be wrought by the bombs of Morosini. When Des Hayes was there the Parthenon was as entire and as little damaged by the injuries of time as if it had only just been built. The Turks, whatever their faults may have been, had shown great respect for the venerable relics of ancient Athens, which had now been in their power for two centuries. When a piece of the frieze of Phidias fell they carefully placed it inside the Parthenon, the interior of which was at that time entirely whitewashed;[55] the external appearance of that noble temple, as it then was, can be judged from the published drawings of Carrey. The Akropolis was fortified, and occupied by the garrison, whose houses, about 200 in number, covered a portion of its surface, and the Odeion of Heródes Atticus (then called Serpentzés) was joined by a wall with and formed a bulwark of it. The Propýlaia served as the residence of the commander, the *disdar-aga*, whose harem was in the Erechtheion,[56] and the Temple of Wingless Victory had been converted into a powder magazine. Unfortunately the Turks had also stored their ammunition in the Propýlaia, and in 1656 a curious accident caused it to explode. At that time Isouf Aga, the commander of the Akropolis and a bitter enemy of the Greeks, had vowed that he

[52] Babin in Laborde, i. 188 n.
[53] Finlay, v. 100.
[54] Spon, ii. 192–4; Laborde, i. 163.
[55] Laborde, i. 81, 198; Spon, ii. 121.
[56] Spon, ii. 122.

would destroy the little church of St. Demétrios, on the opposite hill. One evening, before going to bed, he ordered two or three pieces of artillery to be put in position to fire on the church in the morning. But in the night a thunderbolt ignited the powder magazine. The Aga and nearly all his family perished by the force of the explosion, and—what was a more serious loss—part of the roof was destroyed. The Greeks ascribed the disaster to the righteous indignation of the saint, whose church was thenceforth, and is still, called St. Demétrios the Bombardier.[57] On another occasion, so it was said, when a Turk fired a shot at an eikon of the Virgin in the Parthenon his arm withered, while another Mussulman was reported to have dropped dead in the attempt to open two great cupboards, closed with blocks of marble and let into the walls.[58] For the great Temple of Olympian Zeus the Turks had a becoming regard, and at the solemn season of Bairam they used to meet near its columns to pray. The Areiopagos, from the spring of 'black water' still to be found there, they called *Kara-su*. Less scrupulous than the Turks, De Nointel took two workmen about with him on his tour, and carried off several pieces of marble, just as the Jesuits had taken with them to Chalkís some of the marble fragments of Athens to serve as monuments in their cemetery.[59]

The Piraeus, which had played so great a part in the life of ancient Athens, consisted at that time of only a single house—a magazine for storing goods and levying the duties on them.[60] Its classical name had been lost, and while the Franks called it Porto Leone the Greeks styled it Porto Drákо,[61] from the huge lion, now in front of the arsenal at Venice, upon which Harold Hardraada had once scrawled his name, and which attracted the attention of all travellers. The foundations of the famous Long Walls were still visible almost all the way, and on the road to Eleusis there was another fine marble lion, which can be traced in the Capuchins' plan. The Monastery of Daphní had been almost entirely abandoned, owing to the ravages of corsairs, Christians as well as Turks, and the former had driven away all the inhabitants of Eleusis; but the Monastery of Phaneroméne, in Salamis, had just been restored by Lauréntios of Mégara in 1670, and a little later, in 1682, the church at Kaisariané was decorated with fresh paintings by a Peloponnesian artist at the expense of the Athenians who had fled thither for fear of the plague. All along the shore near Pháleron stood towers, where men watched day and night to give the alarm against the pirates. Such was the terror inspired by those marauders that not a single Turk resided at Mégara, and there was only one house between that place and Corinth. The

[57] Spon, ii. 107–8; Laborde, i. 81.
[58] Babin, in Laborde, i. 199.
[59] Randolph, *The Present State of the Islands in the Archipelago*, p. 5.
[60] Spon, ii. 179.
[61] The Greeks call any large beast a δράκος.

Kakè Skála maintained its classic reputation as a haunt of robbers, and descendants of the fabulous brigand Skiron were in the habit of lurking there, so that the Turks were afraid to travel along that precipitous road where the railway now passes above the sea. Acrocorinth, in spite of its ruinous condition, was, however, a sure refuge of the Mussulmans against the corsairs, while Lepanto, on the other hand, was a perfect nest of pirates.[62]

Of the Greek provincial towns at that period Chalkís, with a population of about 15,000, was the most important. It was the residence of the capitan pasha and the scene of the Jesuits' missionary labours. They had established a school there, after their departure from Athens, and the children of the seven or eight Frank families who still resided in the old Venetian town gave them more occupation than they had found at their former abode. The castle was entirely given over to the Turks and Jews, and the traveller Randolph mentions in his day the rich carving of some of the houses, which I have myself seen there. Patras, famous for its citrons, contained some 4,000 or 5,000 inhabitants, one-third of whom were Jews, and the latter had three synagogues at Lepanto, which had the whole trade of the gulf, though they were less numerous there than at Patras. Corinth was then, like the modern town, a big village with a population of 1,500, and it was noted for the numbers of conversions to Islâm which had taken place there. Like Athens, it had no Jews. Nauplia, the residence of the pasha of the Morea, was a large town, but Sparta was 'quite forsaken.'[63] Delphi, then called Kastrí, was the fief of a Turk, and produced cotton and tobacco. The neighbouring town of Sálona contained seven mosques and six churches, and at the splendid Byzantine monastery of Hósios Loukâs there were about 150 monks. Thebes was then about the same size as at present, and had no more than 3,000 or 4,000 inhabitants, while its rival, Livádia, provided all Greece with wool, corn, and rice. Somewhat earlier it had furnished sail-cloth for the Ottoman navy,[64] and in the Turkish period it enjoyed considerable liberty, being administered by a δημογέρων, or elder, who, with the assistance of the leading citizens, successfully resisted any intervention from outside in the affairs of his native city.[65] In the Morea, where there were only 30,000 Turks, and nearly all those Greek-speaking, each town was managed by its own Greek elders, who levied the taxes. Spon found there four metropolitans, whose sees were respectively Patras, Nauplia, Corinth, and Mistrâ, and he remarks, as every modern traveller in the country districts of Greece

[62] Spon, ii. 211, 213, 220, 223, 230; Randolph, *Present State of the Morea*, p. 1.

[63] Vernon, *ubi supra*, ii. 22, 25.

[64] Spon, ii. 16, 23, 28, 41, 51, 57–62, 65, 73, 232, 246; Finlay, v. 100; Vernon, *ubi supra*, ii. 27.

[65] Paparregópoulos, v. 590.

cannot fail to do, on the strict fasts observed by the orthodox. He found that the sole exception was in the case of those who were subjects of Venice and who had imbibed the laxer ideas of Roman catholicism; as for the others, they would rather die than dine in Lent.[66] The value of the Peloponnesian trade may be judged from the fact that an English consul, Sir H. Hide, had lately resided at Glárentza and had built a church there.[67]

The former duchy of Náxos, then a Turkish *sandjak*, had been lightly treated by the Turks since their final conquest of the islands. In 1580 Murad III had given the islanders many privileges, permitting them to build churches and monasteries and to use bells, while forbidding the Turks to settle among them, a provision which has done much to keep the Cyclades free from all traces of Mussulman rule. Once a year, and once only, came the capitan pasha to levy the tribute of the islands at Páros; but the tribute was raised by the insular municipalities, whose powers of self-government were not disturbed by the Turkish conquerors. The inhabitants of some islands were, however, bound to send a fixed quantity of their produce to Constantinople every year.[68] These privileges were confirmed by Ibrahim in 1640, and we may form some idea of the state of the Cyclades from the amount of the capitation tax levied upon them at the date of Spon's tour. Náxos was then assessed at 6,000 *piastres*, out of which the governor had to provide one galley to the Turkish fleet; Andros paid 4,500, with which one galley was equipped, while Euboea paid 100,000 *piastres*, and the Morea was bound to furnish three vessels.[69] At that time the Venetian island of Tênos was the best cultivated, the most prosperous, and the most densely populated of all the Cyclades, because the banner of St. Mark protected it from the Christian corsairs, whose chief rendezvous was at Mêlos, and who captured, among others, the English traveller Vernon. Tênosthen contained twenty-four villages, the inhabitants of which, 20,000 in number, speaking Greek, but almost entirely of the catholic religion, were exclusively employed in the manufacture of silk. Randolph, who visited this island in 1670, found it to have 'ever been a great eyesore to the Turks,' especially during the Candian war, when a certain Giorgio Maria, a Corsican privateer in the Venetian service, had manned his ships with the islanders of Tênos, and had plagued the enemies of the republic as none had done since Skanderbeg. Tênos had quite recovered from the raid which the Turks had made upon it in 1658; but since the war its inhabitants had thought it prudent to offer the capitan pasha a *douceur* of 500 dollars, in addition to the regular tithe which they

[66] Spon, ii. 219, 270–3. [67] Randolph, *The Present State of the Morea*, p. 4.
[68] Hopf, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*, lxxxvi. 172, 189.
[69] Spon, i. 149.

paid to Venice.[70] The only thing on Dêlos was the colony of rabbits. Mýkonos, which Venice still kept,[71] had not a single Turk, and the chief profession of its inhabitants was piracy, which kept so many of the men engaged at sea that there was an enormous disproportion between the females and the males.

Corsairs were indeed the terror of the Aegean, as was natural now that the Candian war was over and they had no more scope for the legitimate exercise of their talents. Thus in 1673 a Savoyard, the marquis de Fleury, set out to take Páros, but was captured by the Venetians in pursuance of their pledge, given to the Turks at the late peace, not to tolerate piracy in the Archipelago. Another freebooter, a Provençal, named Hugo de Creveliers, who served as the original of Lord Byron's 'Corsair,' and had roamed about the Levant from boyhood, succeeded in making Páros his headquarters, after a futile attempt upon a Turkish fort in Maina, and scoured the Aegean with a fleet of twenty ships for two whole years, levying blackmail upon Mégara and defying capture, till at last he was blown up in his flagship by a servant whom he had offended. Another pirate, a Greek, named Joánnes Kápsi, made himself master of Mêlos in 1677, but was taken and hanged by the Turks in 1680. Nevertheless the lot of the Melians was so hard that a party of them, together with some Samians, emigrated to London, under the guidance of a certain Georgerínes of Mêlos, at that date. It is to this colony that Greek Street owes its name, for the duke of York, the future king James II, assigned that site to them as a residence, and in Hog Lane, afterwards called Crown Street, Soho, they built a Greek church—the first in London.[72] Even where the privateers did not come the Turks took care to 'hinder the islanders from becoming too rich.'

The Latin population of the Cyclades had not diminished, though a century had elapsed since the last of the Latin dukes had fallen; on the contrary, it had increased, in consequence of the emigration thither after the Turkish conquest of Crete. Náxos and Santorin were the chief seats of these Latin survivors, who were sedulously guarded by the Roman church. Down to the seventeenth century a Latin bishopric was maintained in Andros, and one still exists at Santorin, another at Syra, and a third at Tênos. In 1626 the Jesuits, and nine years later the Capuchins, obtained a convent in Náxos, which was placed under the protection of France; and after

[70] Randolph, *The Present State of the Islands in the Archipelago.*

[71] Hopf (*ubi supra*, lxxxvi. 177) says that Mýkonos remained Venetian after 1671, and this is the general view. But Spon (*op. cit.* i. 145–6) says that in his day it was not under the Venetians; the governor was a Greek of Constantinople, and once a year the Turkish galleys levied *haratch* there. He is confirmed by Randolph, who tells of a visit of the capitan pasha to Mýkonos in 1680.

[72] Hopf, *ubi supra*, lxxxvi. 177; Sáthas, Τουρκοκρατουμένη Ἑλλάς, 310, Νεοελληνικὴ Φιλολογία, 345.

the fall of Rhodes the Latin archbishopric was removed to the same island,[73] where the catholics held much property. But this concentration of catholicism in Náxos had some most unfortunate results, which were happily lacking in the less strenuous atmosphere of Santorin. The Latins of the upper town of Náxos looked down contemptuously upon the Greek inhabitants of the lower city; they refused to intermarry with the orthodox; and if a catholic changed his religion for that of the despised Greeks he was sure of persecution by his former co-religionists. In the country, where old feudal usages still prevailed, the Latin nobles oppressed the Greek peasants; while, like truly oriental tyrants, they were as servile to the Turks as they were haughty to the Greeks. Worst of all, their feuds became hereditary, and thus this little island community was plunged in almost endless bloodshed. For example, towards the close of the seventeenth century the leader of the Latin party in Náxos was Francesco Barozzi, whose family had come thither from Crete about the beginning of the same century, and whose surname I have found still preserved in the monuments of the catholic church in the upper town. Barozzi had married the daughter of the French consul, who was naturally a person of consequence among the catholics of Náxos. But the lady was one day insulted by Constantine Cocco, a member of a Venetian family which had become thoroughly grecised. Barozzi, furious at the slight, took a terrible vengeance, and not long afterwards Cocco was murdered by his orders, and his body horribly mutilated. Cocco's relatives thereupon murdered the French consul; the consul's widow persuaded a Maltese adventurer, Raimond de Modène, who had recently arrived on a frigate belonging to the Knights of St. John, and who was in love with her daughter, to bombard the Cocco family with the ship's cannon in the Monastery of Ipsili, where they had taken refuge. At last the vendetta ended as a dramatist would have wished. The daughter of the murdered Cocco, who was only one year old at the time of her father's assassination, married the son of her father's murderer. For many years the couple lived happily together, and the wife was the first woman in the Archipelago to wear Frankish dress. But, though the fatal feud was thus appeased, poetic vengeance, in the shape of the Turks, fell upon the assassin's son. His riches attracted their attention; he was thrown into prison, and died at Náxos a beggar.[74]

Such was the condition of Greece when, in 1684, the outbreak of war between Venice and Turkey led to the temporary reconquest of a large part of the country by the soldiers of the West and the reappearance of the lion of St. Mark in the Morea.

WILLIAM MILLER.

[73] Hopf, *ubi supra*, lxxxvi. 172–3.

[74] Hopf, *Veneto-byzantinische Analekten*, pp. 422–6; and in Ersch and Gruber, lxxxvi. 177.

The 'Mayflower'

MORE than one writer upon New-England history has attributed the landing of the pilgrim fathers at Plymouth, instead of in Virginia, whither they intended to go, to the evil doings of the master of the 'Mayflower.' It has been suggested that he was instigated either by the Dutch of New Amsterdam or by Sir Robert Rich, who was at variance with the Virginia Company, to plant the colonists upon a shore far removed from that to which he was employed to carry them. These suggestions are founded mainly upon the assumption that the master, who we know from Bradford's history was a 'Mr.' Jones, was a certain Captain Thomas Jones, of whose character and connexions enough is known to make such a suggestion credible. The identity of the master of the 'Mayflower' is therefore a matter of some historical importance, and of more than local or antiquarian interest. The object of the present paper is to bring forward, from a source that has not hitherto been explored, some evidence to show that the master of the pilgrim fathers' ship was not Captain Thomas Jones; that he was one Christopher Jones, against whose character nothing is known; and that the theory of a conspiracy to deposit the pilgrim fathers at Cape Cod, under colour of a contract to land them elsewhere, so far as it rests upon the supposed evil character of Mr. Jones, has no foundation in fact. The mistake which has been committed in identifying Mr. Jones with Captain Thomas Jones has arisen in consequence of the supposed absence of any evidence as to the history and career of the pilgrim fathers' ship before and after she made the historic voyage. No serious attempt has hitherto been made to identify her with any one of the many 'Mayflowers' that are known to have been afloat in and about 1620. When a ship named 'Mayflower' occurs in a document of the period, it is commonly assumed that probably she is the pilgrim fathers' ship. The facts stated below will show that conjecture resting only upon identity of name is of very slight value.

The name 'Mayflower' was, in fact, very common in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Besides Scotch and Irish 'Mayflowers,' of which there were several, there were 'Mayflowers' belonging to almost every port in England. There were 'May-

flowers' of Aldeburgh, Brightlingsea, Bristol, Chester, Dover, Grimsby, Looe, Lyme, Lynn, Maidstone, Millbrook, Newcastle, Plymouth, Portland, Rye, St. Ives, Sandwich, Scarborough, Shoreham, Southwold, Stockton, Stonehouse, Swansea, York, Weymouth, and Whitby. And although the same ship is not always described as belonging to the same port, some of the larger ports, such as Ipswich, London, Newcastle, and Yarmouth, possessed two or even several 'Mayflowers' apiece. There cannot have been fewer than forty or fifty 'Mayflowers' existing between A.D. 1550 and 1700. There were 'Mayflowers' trading to Virginia and New England, to the East and West Indies, to Africa, the Levant, and the Mediterranean, to Greenland, Norway, Spain, Portugal, Scotland, and Ireland. There were 'Mayflowers' in the service of the king and 'Mayflowers' in the service of parliament, 'Mayflowers' East Indiamen, men-of war, privateers, whalers, slavers, colliers, and fishermen; 'Mayflowers' of all sorts and sizes, from 15 to 400 tons. In the autumn of 1620, while the pilgrim fathers' ship was on her outward voyage, at least two other seagoing 'Mayflowers' were under way, one in Eastern seas and one in the Thames. So fruitful in 'Mayflowers' are the records that it is very difficult to distinguish them, and still more difficult to identify any one of them with the pilgrim fathers' ship. The task would indeed be impossible were it not for a mass of records which, to all appearance, have never been systematically searched for this or any other purpose, the records, namely, of the High Court of Admiralty. It is not possible here to describe these records, which have only recently been thrown open to the public. It is enough to state that during the Elizabethan and Stuart periods much of the shipping business of the country came before the Admiralty court, and that there is no class of records which contains so many references to the ships of that period as the records of that court. They are very voluminous, but are almost wholly without calendar or index, and a great part of them are in the utmost confusion. An exhaustive search of them would be the work of a lifetime; and it is probable that some documents relating to the subject before us have escaped the notice of the present writer.

The constant occurrence in these records of ships bearing the name of 'Mayflower' is confusing. Nevertheless it is not difficult, by collecting a large number of references, to reduce the number of possible pilgrim fathers' 'Mayflowers' to some half-dozen ships; for many craft bearing the name may be at once dismissed as impossible; such, for example, are all 'Mayflower' pinks, hoys, fishermen, and small craft, and all 'Mayflowers' built after or lost before the year 1620.[1]

[1] A large number of references cannot be made use of, because no fact stated in any one of them enables us to identify the 'Mayflower' to which it relates.

The first step towards identifying the pilgrim fathers' ship with a 'Mayflower' mentioned in the records is to collect all the facts bearing upon her identity which are to be gathered from outside sources. These are scanty and may be summed up in a few lines. Bradford, Mourt, Winthrop, Prince, Neill, and Hazard are our authorities. From them we learn that between 1620 and 1630 a 'Mayflower,' or 'Mayflowers,' crossed the seas three times. One in 1620 carried the pilgrim fathers to New Plymouth; one in 1629 carried Higginson's party to Salem; and one in 1630 carried Winthrop's party to Charlestown. It has generally been assumed that these three voyages were made by the same ship; but the strong probability is that the voyages of 1629 and 1630 were not made by the ship that sailed in 1620. Our reasons for arriving at this conclusion are given below. In this connexion it may be stated that besides the three 'Mayflower' voyages above mentioned at least three and probably more voyages were made by other 'Mayflowers' to America during the first half of the seventeenth century.

As to the pilgrim fathers' ship, the historians give us the following particulars. First, as to her name: this we should expect to find in Bradford's history, but it is not there; nor is it mentioned by Mourt: it occurs in the records of the old colony of the year 1623; and 'A Note of the shipping, men, and provisions sent and provided for Virginia by the Right Honorable the Earl of Southampton and the Company this year 1620,' preserved among the duke of Manchester's papers,[2] mentions 'the May-Flower of 140 tuns, sent in August 1620, with 100 persons.' This, it would seem, must be the pilgrim fathers' ship; but the note is not accurate, for she was not 'sent and provided' by Lord Southampton's Virginia Company, but by the Plymouth Adventurers. As to the tonnage of the 'Mayflower,' Bradford says that her burden was 'about nine score.' This has universally been interpreted to mean nine score tons; but it is possible that Bradford meant nine score lasts (about 340 tons); and, if that be so, the ship of the Manchester papers would not be Bradford's ship. The 'last' was the Dutch unit of measurement, and when Robert Cushman wrote to Bradford about a ship which he was inclined to charter for the Leyden Company he described her as of sixty lasts. The probability, however, is that the traditional interpretation of Bradford's phrase is correct. The pilgrim fathers' ship had two decks. This we know from Mourt, who tells us that her shallop, a boat able to carry twenty-five persons under sail, was with some difficulty stowed 'betwixt the decks.' As to her age in 1620, it would seem that she was not then a new ship. This may be inferred from several facts. Bradford tells us that on the voyage out one

[2] No. 291; not fully set out in *Hist. MSS. Comm. 8th Report*, pt. ii. App. p. 37b.

of the beams in the midships was 'bowed and cracked,' and that her condition was so critical that, had she not been halfway out to New England, her master would have abandoned the voyage. The passengers lay wet in their berths, and continual caulking failed to keep the decks staunch. She was, says Captain John Smith, 'a leaking, unwholesome ship.' But her master, who knew her well, had faith in her; and after straining the buckled beam into its place with a screw-jack the crew shored it up and decided to continue the voyage. They were obliged, however, to keep the ship under small sail, and to ease her as much as possible.

Her master, we know from Bradford, was a 'Mr.' Jones. Unfortunately we are not told his Christian or first name. The records supply us with a 'Mayflower' of 1609–1624, whose master and part owner was a Christopher Jones; and it is this connexion of a 'Mayflower' with a master whose name was Jones that enables us to identify the pilgrim fathers' ship, and to follow her career in the records for at least thirteen years. The master of our ship being for the present assumed (though hereafter, it is submitted, he is proved) to be Christopher Jones, it is perhaps superfluous to show that he cannot have been the Captain Thomas Jones above mentioned. Inasmuch, however, as Captain Thomas Jones was undoubtedly trading to New England in 1620, and has for this reason been supposed by more than one writer to have been the master of the pilgrim fathers' ship, it may be well to state that the Admiralty court records show that Captain Thomas Jones was in Virginia, in command of the 'Falcon,' in September 1620, at the time when 'Mr.' Jones was on his outward voyage to New Plymouth in the pilgrim fathers' ship, and that in April 1621 the former was being sued in England by some of the 'Falcon's' crew for their wages, when the latter was on his voyage home from New Plymouth to England.[3] The historians do not tell us the names of any of the owners of the pilgrim fathers' ship. This is unfortunate, because the identity of the ship in the records can frequently be traced by owners' names. Nor do they tell us to what port she belonged. All we can gather from them is that she was chartered, probably in London, in July 1620.

As to the date and place of her sailing, we know that she sailed from London, some days before 19 July 1620, for Southampton, and that she arrived at the latter port on that day. She sailed from Southampton on 5 August, and soon afterwards put into Dartmouth. Thence she sailed on 23 August, but had again to put back to Plymouth. From Plymouth she sailed on 6 Sept., and arrived at her destination in New England on 11 Nov. She lay in New Plymouth harbour through the winter of 1620–1, and sailed

[3]. For the authorities for this and other statements see the note below, p. 680.

back for England on 5 April, arriving on the 5th or 6th of May. During the voyage out she had on board, besides her crew, 102 passengers.

These are nearly all the facts to be gathered from contemporary writers which will assist us in our search for the pilgrim fathers' ship among the records. They are set forth here at some length because, if any one of them were inconsistent with any fact stated in the records touching the ship in this paper called Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower,' the conclusion at which we shall arrive as to her identity with the pilgrim fathers' ship would be wrong. It is necessary, therefore, to state here that, so far as the writer is aware, there is nothing stated in the records about Christopher Jones's ship which is inconsistent with what the chroniclers tell us about the pilgrim fathers' ship.

There is a passage in Mourt's *Relation* which is of some importance in connexion with a 'Mayflower' whaler mentioned in the records, about which ship something will be said below. The passage is as follows. Speaking of whales seen by 'Mr.' Jones and the crew of the pilgrim fathers' ship on the New England coast during the winter of 1620–1, Mourt says:

> Our master and his mate and others experienced in fishing professed we might have made 3,000*l.* or 4,000*l.* worth of oil. They preferred it before Greenland whale fishing, and purposed the next winter to fish for whale here.

From this passage it would seem reasonable to infer that previously to 1620 'Mr.' Jones, or some of his crew, had either been on a whaling voyage themselves or had some acquaintance with whale fishery. Now the records of the Admiralty court show that in 1624, and again in 1626, a 'Mayflower' of Yarmouth (or of Hull) was whaling in Greenland. And although the whaler of 1624 probably was not Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower' it will be seen below that there is reason to think that at least two of the owners of Jones's ship were part owners of the whaler of 1624. Further, Purchas in his *Pilgrims* (iii. 565) tells us that a Master Jones was whaling at Cherrie Island[4] in 1609, the year in which we first find Christopher Jones's name as master of the 'Mayflower' in northern seas. Purchas tells us also (iii. 560, 561) that whalers sailed from Harwich; and it will be shown below that both Christopher Jones and his ship are described as 'of Harwich' in a document of 1611. There are other indications pointing to the conclusion that Jones's 'Mayflower' may have been a whaler before 1620. The whaling fleet of 1624, of which the 'Mayflower' of Yarmouth (or of Hull) was one, was fitted out

[4] This probably was one of the ships set out by Roger Jones, Henry Jones, John Jones, and James Duppa, merchants; Admiralty Court Exam. 40, 4 and 13 Oct. 1609; Exam. 108, 6 Oct. 1609; Acts 27, 15 Sept., 7 Oct., 25 Oct., 21 Nov. 1609.

by merchants of York and Hull; and this fleet had been whaling in Greenland for several years before 1624. Aldeburgh has always been closely connected with the neighbouring fishing port of Yarmouth; it is distant from Yarmouth only about 30 miles, and it was at this date a member of the port of Yarmouth. At Aldeburgh, it will be seen below, there was built in or about the year 1624 a new 'Mayflower,' and the master of this new 'Mayflower' was part owner of Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower.' Since, as is stated above, there is reason to think that the new 'Mayflower' built at Aldeburgh was the whaler of 1624, it seems reasonable to conjecture that she was built to supply the place of the old (Christopher Jones's) 'Mayflower,' and that the old 'Mayflower' had also been a whaler.

To return to the historic ship, we have gathered from the chroniclers her name and tonnage, her occupation from July 1620 to May 1621, and the surname of her master. We now turn to the Admiralty court records for information about Christopher Jones and his 'Mayflower.' Only those documents are here quoted which certainly relate to the same ship, her identity throughout being assured by statements as to her owner's or master's name and as to her tonnage. Upon the last point it is necessary to state that the records cannot be relied upon for accuracy in their statements as to a ship's tonnage. The same ship is found to be described as of 200, 240, 250 tons; and sometimes the figures vary more than this. Nor is it safe to rely upon the description of a ship as belonging to a named port as evidence of identity. The same ship is frequently described as belonging to different ports. Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower' is described sometimes as 'of London' and twice as 'of Harwich.' She may nevertheless have been owned in Aldeburgh, Ipswich, or elsewhere. As regards her connexion with Harwich, that port is much frequented by ships bound either to Ipswich or to Aldeburgh. It is, in fact, the entrance to the Ipswich river, and many ships bound into Orford Haven (the entrance to the Aldeburgh river, about 7 miles distant) bring up at Harwich, in order to wait there until the tide serves to cross the bar at Orford Haven. The Aldeburgh river is very difficult to enter, and the bar can be crossed only at the top of high water. Consequently at the present day Aldeburgh cod smacks, and other vessels of any draught, are constantly in and out of Harwich harbour.

Christopher Jones first appears in the records as master of a 'Mayflower' in a document of 1609. Two years before this he is stated to have been owner and master of the 'Josan' (or 'Jason') of London. In her he made a voyage to Bordeaux in 1606 or 1607, and brought prunes to London. He sued James Campbell for freight of the prunes, and the suit was stayed by prohibition

from the Common Pleas on 22 May 1611. Of the history of Jones's 'Mayflower' before 1609 nothing can be stated for certain. Her name does not appear in the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission upon the Ipswich records, and the present writer has not succeeded in finding it amongst the (unpublished) records of the Harwich corporation. It is possible, however, that a more careful search at one of these places, or at Aldeburgh, or Yarmouth, or Hull, may discover further facts as to her ownership and history. The records of the Admiralty court and other sources contain a good deal of information about 'Mayflowers' of an earlier date, but no fact is stated about any one of them which enables us to identify her with Jones's ship. We are told of a 'Mayflower' of Dover, which had wine on board in 1603, and some years later was in Barbary; a 'Mayflower' or 'Mayflowers' of Hull, referred to in documents dated between 1573 and 1582; a 'Mayflower' of Ipswich of 120 tons, built after 1571, and mentioned again (or another 'Mayflower' of Ipswich) in 1598; a 'Mayflower' of Lynn of 150 tons, which fought the Spaniards under Lord Edward Seymour in 1588; a 'Mayflower' of London of 250 tons, owned by John Vassall and others, fitted out by the Londoners for the queen in 1588, and mentioned in documents until 1594; a 'Mary Floure' of Newcastle, of 140 or 160 tons, which was captured from the Scots in 1558, rebuilt in 1566, and was trading in 1582; another 'Mayflower' of Newcastle (or possibly the same ship) trading to Africa in 1601–2; a 'Mayflower' of Southwold that was fishing at Iceland in 1593; and a 'Mayflower' of Yarmouth of 120 tons, of the year 1593. No evidence has been found of the loss, capture, or breaking up of any of these ships; and Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower' may be any one of them.

The records give the following particulars of the doings of Christopher Jones's ship from 1609 to 1624. In August 1609 Andrew Pawlinge chartered the 'Mayflower,' Christopher Jones master, Robert Childe, Christopher Jones, and probably also Christopher Nicholls and Thomas Shorte, being her owners, for a voyage from London to Drontheim, in Norway, and back to London. Her cargo on the return voyage consisted wholly or in part of tar, deals, and herrings. She met with bad weather, lost an anchor and cable, and made short delivery of her herrings. Litigation followed, and was proceeding in 1612. Another suit arose out of this voyage which is of more interest. In 1609, when the 'Mayflower' was lying in the Thames, goods on board were arrested, at the suit of the king, for a crown debt owing by Pawlinge. Richard Nottingham claimed to be then owner of the goods under an assignment from Pawlinge. On behalf of the crown it was alleged that the assignment was fraudulent, and made for the purpose of evading

payment of Pawlinge's debt to the crown. Application was made to the court by Nottingham that the goods should be released on bail. The judge of the admiralty, Sir Richard Trevor, doubted whether he could take bail in a crown suit, and refused to release the goods. Subsequently Nottingham procured the opinion of Sir Henry Hobart, attorney-general, that the goods might be released. This opinion was submitted to the court, and upon the strength of it the goods were released. In the course of this suit the 'Mayflower's' charter-party and a receipt by Christopher Jones for payment by Nottingham of freight and other charges on the goods were produced as evidence of Nottingham's ownership of the goods. These documents were filed in the registry of the Admiralty court, but apparently they have been lost.

In January 1611 Christopher Jones was probably at London in the 'Mayflower.' In the Thames estuary he had picked up at Gore End some wreckage, sails and other ship's gear, which were presented as admiralty droits and claimed on behalf of the lord high admiral. In the appraisement of their value, dated 14 Jan. 1610–1, Christopher Jones is described as of Harwich, and his ship is called the 'Mayflower' of Harwich. In 1613 the 'Mayflower,' Christopher Jones master, was twice in the Thames, once in July and again in October and November. Export duties upon stockings, bayes, and coney skins, part of her outward cargoes, were paid in London. In 1614 Christopher Jones was again party to an Admiralty suit. There are several other references to a 'Mayflower' in the years 1613, 1614, and 1615, but the particulars given are not sufficient to identify the ship. The next reference, which certainly relates to Christopher Jones's ship, is in 1616. In that year John Cawkin came on board her in the Thames, and there, according to Jones's statement, misconducted himself by inciting the crew to mutiny, abusing Jones, and drinking from the cargo of wine. For these matters he was sued by Jones in the Admiralty court, with what result does not appear. Cawkin was an officer of the court, and he may have been on board the 'Mayflower' in connexion with the death of Edward Baillie, who was drowned from a 'Mayflower' in the Thames about this time. The claim of the Admiralty coroner to hold an inquest upon bodies found in the Thames not infrequently led to trouble at this date. The mention of wine on board suggests that the 'Mayflower' had recently been on a voyage to France, Spain, Portugal, the Canaries, or some other wine country.

After 1616 no record has been found which certainly relates to Jones's 'Mayflower' until the year 1624. This is remarkable, for a ship trading to London does not usually disappear for so long a time from the records. No Admiralty court document relating to the pilgrim fathers' voyage of 1620 has been found, and no litiga-

tion arose out of the voyage. Perhaps the hurry and secrecy with which the transfer of the pilgrims from Leyden to New England was arranged may account for this. Moreover the business of the Admiralty court at this period was at a low ebb, owing to the vigorous attack which had recently been made upon its jurisdiction by Lord Coke; and paucity of business was accompanied by neglect and dilapidation of its records, many of which belonging to this period have been lost. There is another possible explanation of the silence of the records touching Jones's 'Mayflower' from 1616 to 1624. If the suggestion made above as to the whaling career of the ship is correct, there are reasons why she would not be likely to have come to London during those years. The Muscovy Company were now taking active measures to stop interlopers from Hull and Yarmouth, who were trespassing upon the Company's patent monopoly of whaling in the Northern seas. If Jones's 'Mayflower' was, in fact, one of the Hull and Yarmouth whalers, she would not be likely to have come within reach of the officers of the Admiralty court in London. Had she done so, she would probably have been arrested, and proceedings taken against her as an interloper. There is evidence to show that the east coast whalers carried their oil cargoes to Scotland and Hull; and this, Jones's ship, if she was a whaler, may have done.

The next appearance of Christopher Jones in the records of the High Court is in 1618. In that year he was plaintiff in an Admiralty suit, and is described as of Redrith (Rotherhithe), mariner. In another suit of the same year he was arrested as defendant, and was released upon bail. The name of the 'Mayflower' does not occur in either of these suits. Before 26 Aug. 1622 Christopher Jones died. The books at Somerset House tell us that on that day administration to his effects was granted to Joan, his widow.[5] He must have died between the spring of 1621, when he was in the 'Mayflower' in New England, and 20 Aug. 1622. It is possible that he made whaling voyages in the 'Mayflower' in the summers of 1621 and 1622, but the absence of any whaling gear in the inventory of the 'Mayflower,' made in 1624, and mentioned below, makes this improbable.

About two years after the death of Christopher Jones, on 4 May 1624, Robert Childe, John Moore, and [Joan,] widow of Christopher Jones, owners of three-fourths of the 'Mayflower,' obtained a decree in the Admiralty court for her appraisement. She was then probably lying in the Thames; for the commission of appraisement issued to four mariners and shipwrights of Rotherhithe. The appraisement is extant. It is a significant document, as regards her age and condition. Her hull was valued at 50*l.*; her five anchors at 25*l.*; her one suit of worn sails at 15*l.*; her cables,

[5] 'Prerogative Court Books.'

hawsers, and standing rigging at 35*l.*; her muskets, arms, pitch-pots, and 10 shovels at 3*l.* 8*s.* It does not appear for what purpose the appraisement was made, nor has any other document or reference to the suit, if there was a suit, been found among the Admiralty court records. It is possible that the owner of the remaining one-fourth of the ship was unwilling to contribute to the cost of repairing her, or of fitting her out for a new voyage, and that the other co-owners took proceedings to compel him to contribute; or, possibly, the appraisement was made to fix the value of the widow Joan Jones's one-fourth, for purposes of administration of Christopher Jones's estate. A total value of 160*l.* for a ship of 180 tons seems a low value; but we know that she was at least thirteen years old, and possibly she had been laid up since Christopher Jones's death in 1622, and had been allowed to get out of repair. In the suit of 1609 she was bailed for 800*l.*

The next document[6] which may relate to Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower' is a certificate made by the mayor and bailiffs of Aldeburgh of the losses which that town had suffered by wreck and capture of their ships; and the object of the petition, to which it was probably attached, was doubtless to obtain relief from naval assessment. The certificate gives a list of ships lost and captured, and first amongst them is a 'Mayflower' of Aldeburgh of 160 tons, which is stated to have been owned in Aldeburgh and to have been worth 700*l.* The names of the owners are not given. She was captured on 5 March 1626 by Dunkirkers, while on a fishing voyage to Iceland. As compared with 160*l.*, the appraised value of Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower' in 1624, 700*l.* seems to be excessive, and to point to her being a different ship. But it is certain that the certificate would put the value of the captured ship at the highest possible figure, which would include the value of stores, provisions, fishing gear, and possibly some cargo. Unless the captured ship was ransomed (and there is no evidence that she was ransomed), it is not possible that she was the new ship next mentioned, which was trading for her owners of 1626 in the year 1630. In 1626 Robert Child, John Totten, Michael (or Myles) White, and others not named were owners of a 'Mayflower' of about 200 tons, which had been built at Aldeburgh 'about a year since,' John Moore being designed her master. It will be remembered that Robert Child was a part owner of Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower' in 1609, and that he and John Moore were part owners of her when she was appraised in 1624. Myles White is perhaps the Myles White of London, grocer and rope-seller, who in 1625 owned the 'William and Mary' of Ipswich. The fact that Child and Moore named their new ship 'Mayflower' makes it unlikely that

[6] *S. P. Dom.* Chas. I, cxxvi. no. 55. For this reference I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. M. Oppenheim.

their old 'Mayflower' (Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower') was still afloat and owned by them. If, as is possible, their old ship was the ship that had been captured by Dunkirkers, they would not be unlikely to call their new ship by the old name. The new ship may be the whaler of 1626, which is in that year described as a new ship.

It has been stated above that the voyages made by 'Mayflowers' to New England in 1629 and 1630 were probably not made by the pilgrim fathers' ship. Apart from the probability that the 'Mayflower' captured by Dunkirkers in 1626 was the pilgrim fathers' ship there are other reasons for distinguishing the ships of 1629 and 1630 from that of 1620. In the first place the chroniclers tell us that the ship of 1629 had 14 guns. Ordnance was supplied to ships only upon an order made by the Lord High Admiral; most of these orders are extant, and there is no record of guns having been supplied to Christopher Jones's ship. There is, however, a record of 14 guns having been supplied to a 'Mayflower' 'of London' in 1626; and this ship was not Christopher Jones's 'Mayflower.' In the second place it is not likely that Christopher Jones's ship, which was of some age and weak in 1620, would have been fit to carry 14 guns nine years later, in 1629. Thirdly, the 'Mayflower' of 1629 was chartered by a wealthy body, the Massachusetts Bay Company, who would not have been likely to employ 'a leaky, unwholesome' ship upon an arduous voyage, for which she had proved herself to be hardly fit nine years before. As to the ship of 1630, it is probable that she was the same ship as that which made the voyage of 1629. The subsequent history of this ship can be traced in the records with tolerable certainty and fulness. There is evidence to show that she was afterwards a 'Mayflower' 'of Yarmouth,' owned in and after 1627 by Thomas Hoarth of Yarmouth, and that she also became a whaler.

Since this account was written it has been brought to the notice of the writer by the kindness of Mr. Henry F. Thompson, of Baltimore, that there was on board the pilgrim fathers' ship a Christopher Jones. It is known that he was not one of the colonists; he must, therefore, have been one of the ship's company. Modern research has discovered at Somerset House the will of William Mullens,[7] who died on board the 'Mayflower' at Plymouth in 1621. A copy of the will is certified by John Carver, the governor of the Plymouth colony, Giles Heale, who, there is reason to think, was the doctor of the 'Mayflower,' and 'Christopher Joanes.' It is submitted that, if further evidence were necessary, the discovery of Mullens's will leaves little doubt that the third witness to that will was Bradford s 'Mr.' Jones, the master of the 'Mayflower;' that he was the Christopher Jones of the records,

[7] The Somerset House reference is 68 Dale, ff. 68, 69.

and that the ship whose career we have followed from 1609 to 1624 or 1626 was the pilgrim fathers' ship.

R. G. MARSDEN.

NOTE.

The following references, except where otherwise stated to the records of the High Court of Admiralty, are the principal authorities for the statements in the text:—

Captain Thomas Jones, in the 'Lyon:' 'Acts' 29, 19 & 27 April 1619, ff. 335, 355; 'Libels' 79, no. 60; in the 'Falcon,' 'Lib.' 77, no. 177; 'Lib.' 80, *ad med.*; 'Examinations' 43, April to June 1621; 'Exam.' 109, 10 July 1621; 'Warrant Books' 13, 20 April, 26 Oct. 1621; 'Miscellanea,' 1127.

Christopher Jones, in the 'Josan:' 'Lib.' 75, no. 250; 'Acts' 28, March 1610, April 1611; 'War. Bks.' 12, 6 March 1610; prohibition in Jones *c.* Campbell, 'Common Roll East.' 9 Jac. I, rot. 1506; party to Admiralty suits, 'War. Bks.' 13, 22 June 1614, 5 & 12 May 1618; 'Acts' 29, ff. 249, 251; Jones *c.* Cawkin, 'Lib.' 79, no. 120; 'Acts' 29, f. 253.

'Mayflower,' voyage to Drontheim and suits of Rex *c.* Nottingham, Rex *c.* Pawlin, Jones *c.* Pawlin: 'Acts' 27 & 28, *passim*; 'Lib.' 73, nos. 27, 37, 69; 'Lib.' 74, no. 125; 'Lib. 75, no. 143; 'Exam.' 40, 41, & 42, *passim*; 'War. Bks.' 12, 7 & 10 Dec.; in the 'Thames,' 'Lib.' 74, no. 60; 'K. R. Customs' $\frac{91}{8}$; appraisement, 'Acts' 30, f. 227; 'Lib.' 82, no. 167.

New 'Mayflower,' built at Aldeburgh, *S. P. Dom.* Chas. I, xvi. no. 25; voyage to Spain in 1630 and suit of Totten *c.* Bowyer: 'Lib.' 91, nos. 17, 121, 176; 'Exam.' 112, 27 Jan. 1633; 'Exam.' 113, 21 & 26 June 1634; 'Exam.' 50, 4 March 1633, 24 April 1634; 'War. Bks.' 19, 27 Sept. 1633, 22 July 1634; 'Monitions' 5, no. 72; 'Miscellanea' 949; 'Miscellanea' 1423, f. 20 b.

'Mayflower' whaler and the Hull whaling fleet: 'Exam.' 45, Jan. & Feb. 1626; 'Exam.' 46, 19 April 1627; 'Exam.' 50, 12 & 14 Nov. & 8 Feb. 1633; 'Exam.' 51, 15 & 24 Nov. 1634; 'Exam.' 112, 30 Oct. 1633; 'Lib.' 82, no. 5; 'Exam.' 148; 'Interrogatories' 7, *ad med.*; 'Miscell.' 1141; *S. P. Dom.* Chas. I, xvi. no. 30.

Miles White, 'Exam.' 43, 30 May 1621; 'Exam.' 114, 1 Dec. 1635; 'War. Bks.' 15, 17 Feb. 1624.

The French Losses in the Waterloo Campaign.

IT may be said that till within the last few years there were no definite data available for the calculation of the losses of the French army during the Waterloo campaign. Siborne, the most careful of English writers on the subject, contented himself with stating that they were 'immense, but difficult to estimate,' and did not commit himself to figures. More modern narrators of the campaign from this side of the Channel have either copied his example or reproduced French estimates, which are themselves usually echoes from Gourgaud's 36,940,[1] or the 36,500 of the *Victoires et Conquêtes*.[2] Henry Houssaye, whose volumes on 1814–15 have completely superseded the earlier French accounts, because of his infinitely greater care in consulting original documents, gives much higher figures. He allows for 35,000 men lost at Waterloo alone, 12,800 at Ligny and Quatre-Bras, some 2,000 for Grouchy's casualties at Wavre and Namur, and a few hundred for the skirmishes with the Prussians on June 15, in all a total of 51,000 men.[3] This estimate is undoubtedly far nearer to the truth than any which had hitherto appeared, but I think that it is now possible to arrive at a result which approaches even closer to exactitude.

The new evidence which enables us to attack the problem from a secure basis is contained in M. Martinien's '*Tableaux par Corps des Officiers tués et blessés pendant les Guerres de l'Empire* 1805–1815.' This magnificent work of 824 pages consists of regimental lists of all officers killed and wounded in the Napoleonic campaigns, extracted item by item from the records of the regiments at the Archives of the Ministry of War at Paris. It is no mere table of figures, but gives the name and rank of each person cited, and even notes the death of all officers who, though returned as merely wounded, ultimately succumbed to their injuries within a couple of months of the engagement in which they had been disabled. The whole being drawn up by regiments, not by battles, the inquirer must go through the titles of all units engaged in a campaign, if he wishes to obtain the total of losses in it, and then add up the

[1] See Gourgaud, p. 134. [2] See *Victoires et Conquêtes*, xxiv. 229.
[3] See Houssaye's *Waterloo*, pp. 184, 213, and 439–440.

results for himself. This I have done for all the regiments which took part in the Waterloo campaign, in the hope that by the aid of the figures thus obtained we may arrive at some general facts concerning the French losses in 1815. The results are embodied in the annexed tables. It will be seen that they differ very appreciably from the totals given by M. Houssaye; e.g., he asserts that 720 French officers were killed or wounded on 18 June, and cites M. Martinien as his authority. But the 'Tableaux,' published a year later than his book, show that the real total was not 720, but 1,405. Similarly his estimate for the casualties of Ligny and Quatre-Bras is 346, but Martinien's list of names gives no less than 707 killed and wounded officers.

But it is not only the losses of the whole army considered in general that M. Martinien's tables display to us. We can also deduce from them how the stress of each battle bore upon the larger units of Napoleon's host, the corps, divisions, and brigades. To show the proportion in which each suffered, it is only necessary to prefix to its losses the total number of officers present at the opening of the campaign. These figures I have procured from another admirable work, which has appeared within the last few years, Coudere de Saint-Chamant's *Dernières Armées de Napoléon* (1902). Not till this book came to hand was it possible to arrive at the exact number of officers who took the field with each unit. But by printing in full the last morning-states of the Waterloo army, those of 10–15 June, recovered from the miscellaneous documents of the *Section Historique*, Captain Couderc has enabled us to see what precisely is the meaning of M. Martinien's lists of losses. For example, if we had only the latter before us, we could merely know that at Waterloo the 1st Léger and the 21st of the Line each lost twenty-three officers. But when we note in Captain Couderc's columns that the former regiment had 61 officers in the field, while the latter had but 42 officers, we realise that the one lost only 37 per cent. of its commissioned ranks, the other more than 50 per cent. These percentages of loss in the various units of the army have turned out to be so interesting that I have devoted several paragraphs of comment to them.

The method in which the figures thus collected can be utilised is that which has been applied in many similar cases by military statisticians—the multiplying of the number of casualties among the officers by twenty, as a rough but fairly accurate way of arriving at the number of casualties among the rank and file. This proportion is not that of the actual officers and men present at the opening of the campaign, which seems to have stood at 23 to 1, but allows for the undoubted fact that 'the epaulette attracts the bullets;' i.e. that in all the Napoleonic wars, no less than in the wars of to-day, the officer took more than his fair pro-

portional risk, because his duty sent him to the front. That this figure of 20 to 1 errs rather on the side of understatement than of overstatement seems to result from an examination of the French losses in the Peninsular war. In ordinary line *versus* column engagements, such as the imperial troops were wont to wage with the British in Spain, the average number of casualties of men per officer was decidedly over twenty. The figures of Albuera, Salamanca, and Vittoria were never properly returned by the French commanders, but those of the other main battles of the Peninsular war stand as follows:

Talavera .	266 officers killed or wounded	:	7,002 men	::	1 officer : 26 men
Busaco .	243 „	„	4,241	„	1 officer : 17·4 men
Barrosa .	113 „	„	2,451	„	1 officer : 21·6 men
The Pyrenees .	377 „	„	10,448	„	1 officer : 27·7 men
Nivelle .	174 „	„	4,096	„	1 officer : 28 men
Bayonne & St. Pierre.	268 „	„	5,095	„	1 officer : 21·3 men

At Busaco, if Masséna's return is accurate, the proportion of officers to men disabled is abnormally great; at Talavera and the Pyrenees it is abnormally light. Taking the whole series of battles together, we find that the proportion is one officer killed or wounded to 23·2 men. But we must remember that the Waterloo army was heavily officered; the regiments had their full *cadres* in the commissioned ranks, even when (as in many cases) they were not up to regulation strength in men. In several cavalry regiments the officers stood to the men in a proportion so high as 1 to 12, and in the infantry 1 to 24 was the average. In the Peninsula, on the other hand, it is a repeated complaint of the French commanders, especially of Soult in 1813–14, that the regiments were short of officers. Statistics bear out this allegation: in Masséna's army in 1810 the infantry showed one officer to 26 men; in Soult's army in 1813 there was but one officer to 28 men. We should allow, therefore, that in the Waterloo campaign fewer men per officer were likely to fall, simply because there were fewer men per officer in line. If we find that the Peninsular battles show an average of 23 men hit to one officer, when 26 or 28 men per officer were present, we may grant that a loss of 20 men per officer should be the probable figure for 1815, when only 23 men per officer were in line.

The headings of the columns in the annexed tables for the most part explain themselves. But it is perhaps necessary to point out that the casualties in the column headed 'Small Fights' include (1) the losses of 15 June suffered by the Guard Cavalry, the Reserve Cavalry (Excelmans and Pajol) and Vandamme's infantry,

while driving in Ziethen's corps towards Fleurus; (2) the casualties of 17 June which Subervie's Lancers suffered at the combat of Genappe, when they were engaged with the 7th Hussars and the Household Cavalry of Wellington's rear-guard; (3) the casualties of Maurin's cavalry, and of Gérard's and Vandamme's infantry during Grouchy's retreat on 20 June; (4) those of Teste's division of the 6th Corps, while defending the walls of Namur against the pursuing Prussians on 21 June, on the second day of this same retreat. The third item is far the heaviest, and accounts for just over half of the total of 109 officers killed and wounded in the 'small fights.'

I have included the losses of Ligny and Quatre-Bras in the same column, as they were fought on the same day by different fractions of the French army, and there can be no confusion between them. Those of Quatre-Bras belong to the 2nd Corps (minus Girard's division), L'Héritier's cuirassiers, and the light cavalry of the Guard: they amount to 33 officers killed and 158 wounded. The far heavier losses of Ligny (76 officers killed and 440 wounded) are distributed between the 3rd and 4th corps, Girard's division of the 2nd Corps, the Reserve Cavalry corps of Pajol, Excelmans, and Milhaud, and the infantry and heavy cavalry of the Guard. Of the casualties of the staff in these two battles I have identified and distributed those of the generals by name, but in regard to the 26 aides-de-camp, *adjoints de l'état-major* &c., the only possible course (since M. Martinien gives them simply as 'losses on 16 June') was to credit them to Ligny and Quatre-Bras in the proportion of the other losses of the day—viz. 19 to the first named, and 7 to the second engagement.

Division	Regiment	Officers Present	Ligny and Quatre-Bras		Waterloo		Wavre		Small Fights		Total		General Total
			k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	
1st Corps D'Erlon													
Infantry													
Allix .	54th Line	41	—	—	6	14	—	—	—	—	6	14	20
	55th „	45	—	—	5	14	—	—	—	—	5	14	19
	28th „	42	—	—	6	11	—	—	—	—	6	11	17
	105th „	42	—	—	11	22	—	—	—	—	11	22	33
Donzelot .	13th Léger	61	—	—	7	20	—	—	—	2	7	22	29
	17th Line	42	—	—	5	16	—	—	—	1	5	17	22
	19th „	43	—	—	9	13	—	—	—	—	9	13	22
	51st „	42	—	1	8	11	—	—	—	—	8	12	20
Marcognet	21st Line	42	—	—	7	16	—	—	—	—	7	16	23
	46th „	43	—	—	3	21	—	—	—	—	3	21	24
	25th „	40	—	—	1	30	—	—	—	—	1	30	31
	45th „	43	—	—	3	28	—	—	—	—	3	28	31
Durutte .	8th Line	40	—	—	1	19	—	—	—	—	1	19	20
	29th „	40	—	—	2	8	—	—	—	—	2	8	10
	85th „	40	—	—	5	17	—	—	—	—	5	17	22
	95th „	40	—	—	1	18	—	—	—	—	1	18	19
Cavalry													
Jacquinot .	7th Hussars	28	—	—	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	9	9
	3rd Chasseurs	29	—	—	1	10	—	—	—	—	1	10	11
	3rd Lancers	27	—	—	2	6	—	—	—	—	2	6	8
	4th „	22	—	—	3	6	—	—	—	—	3	6	9
		792	—	1	86	309	—	—	—	3	86	313	399

Division	Regiment	Officers Present	Ligny and Quatre-Bras		Waterloo		Wavre		Small Fights		Total		General Total
			k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	
2nd Corps Reille													
Infantry													
Bachelu	3rd Line	42	—	5	5	20	—	—	—	—	5	25	30
	61st "	41	3	11	4	13	—	—	—	—	7	23	30
	72nd "	40	2	3	1	8	—	—	—	—	3	11	14
	108th "	61	3	14	5	15	—	—	—	—	8	29	37
Prince Jerome	1st Léger	64	—	3	5	18	—	—	—	—	5	21	26
	2nd "	95	—	12	5	10	—	—	1	—	6	20	26
	1st Line	69	6	21	5	13	—	—	—	—	11	34	45
	2nd "	65	1	5	6	20	—	—	—	—	7	25	32
Girard [1]	11th Léger	42	—	20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	20
	82nd Line	27	1	21	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	21	22
	12th Léger	51	—	23	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	23	23
	4th Line	44	1	24	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	24	25
Foy	92nd Line	40	4	2	1	12	—	—	—	—	5	14	19
	93rd "	41	1	1	6	11	—	—	—	—	7	12	19
	4th Léger	59	6	23	2	6	—	—	—	—	8	29	37
	100th Line	51	1	14	1	8	—	—	—	—	2	22	24
Cavalry													
Piré	1st Chasseurs	40	—	2	—	14	—	—	—	—	—	16	16
	6th "	34	—	1	2	11	—	—	—	—	2	12	14
	5th Lancers	25	1	9	—	3	—	—	—	—	1	12	13
	6th "	34	3	8	—	9	—	—	—	—	3	17	20
		965	33	222	48	191	—	—	1	—	82	413	495
3rd Corps Vandamme													
Infantry													
Lefol	15th Léger	62	3	11	—	—	1	14	—	1	4	26	30
	23rd Line	62	1	12	—	—	4	1	—	—	5	13	18
	37th "	59	1	10	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	11	12
	64th "	40	2	11	—	—	1	8	—	—	3	19	22
Habert	34th Line	55	3	14	—	—	2	2	—	1	5	17	22
	88th "	57	12	16	—	—	—	2	1	—	13	18	31
	22nd "	55	—	17	—	—	1	6	1	2	2	25	27
	70th "	45	1	10	—	—	2	2	—	—	3	12	15
	2nd Swiss	21	—	—	—	—	—	9	—	—	—	9	9
Berthezène	12th Line	41	—	13	—	—	—	—	1	4	1	17	18
	56th "	42	1	7	—	—	—	3	—	1	1	11	12
	33rd "	39	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	13	2	13	15
	86th "	44	—	7	—	—	—	—	2	8	2	15	17
Cavalry													
Domon [2]	4th Chasseurs	31	—	—	—	9	—	—	1	2	1	11	12
	9th "	25	—	2	—	10	—	—	—	—	—	12	12
	12th "	29	1	2	1	10	—	—	—	—	2	12	14
		707	25	132	1	29	11	48	8	34	45	241	286
4th Corps Gérard													
Infantry													
Pécheux	30th Line	41	8	13	—	—	—	—	1	2	9	15	24
	96th "	41	3	5	—	—	—	—	2	2	5	7	12
	63rd "	44	2	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	8	10
	75th "	42	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	4	1	4	5
Vichery	59th Line	41	2	11	—	—	3	5	—	—	5	16	21
	76th "	41	1	12	—	—	2	9	—	—	3	21	24
	69th "	40	5	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	5	10
	48th "	42	2	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	13	15
Hulot	9th Léger	45	4	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	10	14
	111th Line	45	2	10	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	11	13
	44th "	44	1	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	9	10
	50th "	36	3	10	—	—	—	2	—	—	3	12	15
Cavalry													
Maurin	6th Hussars	25	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	1	1	2
	8th Chasseurs	25	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	6	6
	6th Dragoons	20	2	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	7	9
	16th "	24	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	4
		596	35	117	—	—	6	23	4	9	45	140	194

[1] This division was detached from its corps, and fought at Ligny, not Quatre Bras.
[2] This division was detached from its corps, and fought at Waterloo, though the 3rd Corps was present at Wavre.

Division	Regiment	Officers Present	Ligny and Quatre-Bras		Waterloo		Wavre		Small Fights		Total		General Total
			k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	
6th Corps Lobau													
Infantry													
Zimmer	5th Line	42	—	—	4	18	—	—	—	—	4	18	22
	11th „	61	—	—	2	16	—	—	—	—	2	16	18
	27th „	39	—	—	1	16	—	—	—	—	1	16	17
	84th „	45	—	—	5	11	—	—	—	—	5	11	16
Jeannin	5th Léger	42	—	—	4	9	—	—	—	—	4	9	13
	10th Line	40	—	—	2	21	—	—	—	—	2	21	23
	47th „	Never joined	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	107th „	44	—	—	4	11	—	—	—	—	4	11	15
Teste[3]	8th Léger	42	—	—	—	—	2	4	—	1	2	5	7
	40th Line	Never joined	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	65th „	22	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	7	1	7	8
	75th „	42	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	4	1	4	5
		419	—	—	22	102	2	4	2	12	26	118	144
CAVALRY RESERVE													
1st Corps Pajol													
P. Soult	1st Hussars	97	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	—	7	7
	4th „		—	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	9
	5th „		—	5	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	6	6
Subervie[4]	1st Lancers	122	—	1	1	13	—	—	—	1	1	15	16
	2nd „		—	—	—	3	—	—	—	14	—	17	17
	11th Chasseurs		—	—	2	10	—	—	—	—	2	10	12
		219	—	15	3	26	—	—	—	23	3	64	67
2nd Corps Excelmans													
Strolz	5th Dragoons	146	—	7	—	—	1	2	—	—	1	9	10
	18th „		—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	4	4
	15th „		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	3	3
	20th „		—	—	—	—	—	—	1	6	1	6	7
Chastel	4th Dragoons	141	—	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	12
	12th „		1	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	8	9
	14th „		2	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	3	5
	17th „		1	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	7	8
		187	4	37	—	—	1	6	1	9	6	52	58
3rd Corps Kellermann													
L'Heritier	2nd Dragoons	138	—	—	6	12	—	—	—	—	6	12	18
	7th „		—	—	1	15	—	—	—	—	1	15	16
	8th Cuirassiers		—	18	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	17	17
	11th „		1	3	2	15	—	—	—	—	3	18	21
Roussel	1st Carabineers	122	—	—	8	13	—	—	—	—	8	13	21
	2nd „		—	—	3	10	—	—	—	—	3	10	13
	2nd Cuirassiers		—	—	2	14	—	—	—	—	2	14	16
	3rd „		—	—	2	11	—	—	—	—	2	11	13
		260	1	16	24	94	—	—	—	—	25	106	135
4th Corps Milhaud													
Wathier	1st Cuirassiers	117	—	—	4	13	—	—	—	—	4	13	17
	4th „		—	—	4	10	—	—	—	—	4	10	14
	7th „		—	—	3	11	—	—	—	—	3	11	14
	12th „		—	—	4	12	—	—	—	—	4	12	16
Delort	5th Cuirassiers	89	1	—	2	12	—	—	—	—	3	12	15
	6th „	22	—	2	—	16	—	—	—	—	—	18	18
	9th „	34	—	2	2	11	—	—	—	—	2	13	15
	10th „	32	1	4	2	11	—	—	—	—	3	15	18
		244	2	8	21	96	—	—	—	—	23	104	127

[3] This division was detached, and fought at Wavre, though the corps was at Waterloo.
[4] This division was detached and served at Waterloo, though Pajol was at Wavre.

Division	Regiment	Officers Present	Ligny and Quatre-Bras		Waterloo		Wavre		Small Fights		Total		General Total
			k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	
Artillery													
Horse .	13 batteries of 1st, 2nd, and 4th Regiments	44	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	2	1	3
Field .	26 batteries of 2nd, 5th, 6th, and 8th Regiments	90	2	1	4	7	—	—	—	2	6	10	16
		134	2	1	6	8	—	—	—	2	8	11	19
Train .	28 companies of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th battalions	57	1	1	1	3	—	—	—	—	2	4	6
Engineers	'Etat-major particulier'	?	—	1	—	8	—	—	—	—	—	9	9
	Sappers and Miners	46	—	—	3	9	—	2	—	—	3	11	14
		46	—	1	3	17	—	2	—	—	3	20	23
Imperial Guard													
Infantry													
Old Guard													
Friant .	1st Grenadiers	86	—	—	1	11	—	—	—	—	1	11	12
	2nd "		—	1	1	15	—	—	—	—	1	15	16
Morand .	1st Chasseurs	89	—	—	1	6	—	—	—	—	1	6	7
	2nd "		—	—	—	11	—	—	—	—	—	11	11
Middle Guard													
Roguet .	3rd Grenadiers	65	—	2	3	13	—	—	—	—	3	15	18
	4th "		—	2	4	13	—	—	—	—	4	15	19
Michel .	3rd Chasseurs	80	—	—	8	17	—	—	—	—	8	17	25
	4th "		—	—	4	11	—	—	—	—	4	11	15
Young Guard													
Duhesme .	1st Tirailleurs	80	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	6	6
	3rd "		1	—	1	8	—	—	—	—	1	8	9
Barrois .	1st Voltigeurs	82	—	—	2	8	—	—	—	—	2	8	10
	3rd "		—	—	2	7	—	—	—	—	2	7	9
Heavy Cavalry													
Guyot .	Grenadiers à cheval	117	—	—	2	17	—	—	—	1	2	18	20
	Dragoons		1	—	3	16	—	—	—	—	4	16	20
	Gendarmes	4	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	2
Light Cavalry													
Lefebvre-Desnouettes	Lancers	139	—	2	1	9	—	—	—	—	1	11	12
	Chasseurs		—	—	6	14	—	—	—	—	6	14	20
Artillery .	9 field batteries	54	—	—	2	9	—	—	—	—	2	9	11
	4 horse "												
Train .		?	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
		806	3	7	41	193	—	—	—	1	44	201	245

STAFF AND NON-REGIMENTAL OFFICERS

Rank	Officers Present	Ligny and Quatre-Bras		Waterloo		Wavre		Small Fights		Total		General Total
		k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	k.	w.	
Généraux de division [5] . .	—	1	4	3	13	—	1	1	1	5	19	24
Généraux de brigade [6] . .	—	1	11	4	16	1	—	—	—	6	27	33
Adjudants-commandants . .	—	—	2	1	8	—	1	—	—	1	11	12
Adjoints d'état-major . .	—	1	11	—	9	—	—	—	—	1	20	21
Ingénieurs-géographes . .	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Aides-de-camp	—	—	11	3	21	1	—	—	1	4	33	37
Commissaires des guerres . .	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Total .	?	3	40	11	68	2	2	1	2	17	112	129
Grand total of whole campaign .	?	109	598 [7]	267	1,138	22	79	17	95	415	1,910	2,325

[5] These were:—Killed at Ligny, Girard, of the 2nd Corps; wounded at Ligny, Habert, of 3rd Corps, and Domon and Maurin, of the cavalry. Wounded at Quatre-Bras, Kellermann. Killed at Waterloo, Desvaux, Michel, and Duhesme, of the Imperial Guard; wounded at Waterloo, Bailly de Monthion, Barrois, Colbert, Friant, Guyot, of the Guard, Durutte, of the 1st Corps, Bachelu and Foy, of the 2nd Corps, Zimmer, of the 6th Corps, Delort, L'Héritier, Roussel, of the cavalry reserve, Radet 'Grand Prévôt de l'armée.' Wounded at Wavre, Gérard, commanding 4th Corps, Teste of 6th Corps. Small Fights: killed, Letort, of Imperial Guard, on 15 June, near Charlerol; wounded, Vandamme, commanding 3rd Corps, in front of Namur, 20 June.

[6] These were:—Killed at Ligny, Le Capitaine, of 4th Corps; wounded at Ligny, Billard and Dufour, of 3rd Corps, Berruyer, of 4th Corps, Devilliers and Piat, of Girard's division of 2nd Corps, Farine, of reserve cavalry; wounded at Quatre-Bras, Gauthier, of 2nd Corps. Killed at Waterloo, Aulard, of 1st Corps, Baudoin and Janin, of 2nd Corps, Donop, of reserve cavalry. Wounded at Waterloo: Gobrecht, Noguez, and Bourgeois, of 1st Corps, Campy and Vathiez, of 2nd Corps, Farine, Guiton, Dubois, Picquet, Travers, Blancard, of reserve cavalry, Cambronne, Harlet, Henrion, Lallemand, of the Guard, Durrieu, of the staff. Killed at Wavre, Penne, of 6th Corps.

[7] Of this Quatre-Bras 33 killed, 157 wounded = 190; Ligny 76 killed, 443 wounded = 519.

The first observation called forth by a study of these tables is that the French losses at Ligny must have been considerably understated by all the historians. We note that at Quatre-Bras 191 officers fell; on an estimate of 20 men hit to each officer, this should give a total casualty list of 3,800 men: as a matter of fact the number was somewhat greater, for Ney and Reille report 4,300 disabled,[4] a proportion of 22 not of 20 to 1. But at Ligny we find that 516 officers were killed or wounded, while in deference, apparently, to Napoleon's statement that he had lost only some 6,000 or 7,000 men, the historians, down to M. Houssaye himself, state the French casualties at figures varying up to, but never exceeding, 8,500 men. This proportion, which would give only 16 men hit per officer, seems entirely improbable. There was nothing in the character of the fighting at Ligny which would make it likely that the officers should suffer in such an abnormal proportion: neither the long cannonade, nor the street firing in Ligny and the two St. Amands, ought to have proved so peculiarly deadly to the commissioned ranks. I am driven to conclude that it would be safer to estimate the total French loss at 10,000 men; even this would be lower than the proportion of 20 to 1 which we have agreed to accept as normal.

Descending to details, we find that by far the heaviest casualties at Ligny fell upon Girard's division of the 2nd Corps, the unit detached from Reille which fought so desperately in the Hameau de St.-Amand. It lost 90 officers out of 164 present, more than

[4] These figures seem perfectly genuine and certain; see Houssaye, pp. 213, 440, and the notes of Gourgaud, who gives the figure at 4,140, Foy, and others.

54 per cent. This fact corroborates all the narratives which speak of it as practically *hors de combat* at nightfall, and accounts for Napoleon having left it behind him on the field of Ligny, to recuperate itself, when he marched off upon the following day.

Of the other troops present at Ligny Vandamme's corps lost 157 officers out of 707 present, a portion of about one in five, or more exactly 22·2 per cent. Gérard's corps suffered 152 casualties among 596 officers present, or about 25·5 per cent. The Reserve Cavalry, who were mainly occupied in observing the Prussian left wing, and of whom only one or two divisions were seriously engaged, seem to have lost only 66 officers out of some 700 present, about 8 per cent. The Imperial Guard suffered even less: the infantry had 5 officers wounded and one killed, the heavy cavalry two killed. It is clear, therefore, that Gourgaud's estimate of 100 of all ranks killed and wounded for the whole Guard is not far wrong, though 160 would be nearer the mark. M. Houssaye's hypothetical estimate of 300 must be hopelessly erroneous; it would give 37 men hit per officer. The figures also render incredible his statement that the 4th Chasseurs of the Guard were so cut up at Ligny that they were reduced from two battalions to one at Waterloo: they had not in the battle of Ligny one single officer killed or wounded, and probably not a score of men. It is clear, therefore, that they had still two battalions on the day of Waterloo, and that Ney's final charge on 18 June was conducted by six not (as M. Houssaye asserts) by five battalions of the Guard.[5]

The figures for Quatre-Bras have nothing very noticeable in them. Reille's corps had 801 officers present (Girard's division being detached at Ligny) and lost 165, one in five, or 20·4 per cent. The unit that suffered most was Foy's division, which had 52 casualties among 191 officers, i.e. 27 per cent. Kellermann's cuirassiers, who gave the English squares so much trouble, must be considered to have got off very lightly with 17 officers hurt out of some 50 present in the one brigade that was engaged. Of these 17, only one, by a curious chance, seems to have been killed outright. Piré's Lancers, who broke the British 69th and nearly rode over the 42nd also, had four officers killed and 17 wounded out of 59—exactly the same proportion of losses as that suffered by the cuirassiers.

Passing on to 17 June we find that the only serious fighting on that day was the combat of Genappe, where Subervie's Lancers, the head of Napoleon's pursuing column, drove in the British 7th Hussars, but were themselves ridden down by the Life Guards. They are recorded to have lost 15 officers out of 73 present, a

[5] M. Houssaye (p. 389) quotes General Petit's narrative as his authority for the statement that the 4th Chasseurs were thus cut up at Ligny and were a battalion short at Waterloo. But there is no such allegation in this narrative, printed *in extenso* in the *English Historical Review* for 1903, pp. 325–6.

sufficient proof that the sharpness of the check has not been exaggerated in British accounts of the skirmish. Of Wellington's two regiments engaged, the 7th lost 4, the 1st Life Guards 1 officer —so that it seems probable that the total French casualties were as three to one compared with the British.

We now come to the awful slaughter of Waterloo. M. Martinien's figures show 267 officers killed and 1,138 wounded as the casualty list of the great battle. This total of 1,405 would seem to give a probable loss of 28,100 for the French army, putting unwounded prisoners aside. Of the latter, as we gather from Wellington's and Blücher's despatches, there were about 7,500 or 8,000, of whom a very small proportion were officers; for at Waterloo, as in other battles, the rank and file surrendered freely when cut off, while the officers either resisted and were shot down, or made desperate efforts to get away and succeeded. In the rout and pursuit after nightfall, during which the majority of the prisoners were taken, this last was more especially the case. Nearly the whole of the remainder of the unwounded captives were taken during the charge of the Union Brigade, when the British cavalry got in among the infantry of Allix, Donzelot, and Marcognet and captured whole companies *en masse*.[6] Two thousand men laid down their arms in ten minutes at this point, but I am compelled by M. Martinien's figures to believe that, while the rank and file yielded, the officers resisted and were cut down. For in the 45th and 105th regiments, which bore the brunt of the charge and both lost their eagles, I find that 64 officers out of 85 present were killed or wounded, though the number of unwounded rank and file taken was very large indeed. But while it is certain that in this part of the field the officers as compared with the men suffered much heavier casualties than their normal one-to-twenty percentage, I imagine that the general average of losses must have been corrected in the pursuit after dark, where the rank and file surrendered, but the officers, having greater initiative and a stronger dislike for capture, got off and escaped.

I should conclude, therefore, that we must place the total loss of the French army at Waterloo at something like 37,000 men out of the 72,000 present, or about 50 per cent. This would allow for the 1,405 officers whom we know to have been killed or wounded, for 28,100 rank and file killed or wounded, and for 7,500 unwounded prisoners, of whom I should guess that not more than 100 were officers.

When we turn to look at the details of the losses of the various

[6] Several narrators speak of one of the main features of the battle-field next morning as being whole rows of muskets neatly laid down in line opposite Picton's position, where organised bodies of French had surrendered simultaneously, on being cut off by the Union Brigade.

units of Napoleon's army, the first fact that strikes us is the very moderate casualty list of those divisions which were opposed to the Prussians, as compared with that of those which fought the British. The force with which Lobau so long held back Blücher consisted of the two infantry divisions of Zimmer and Jeannin, the Young Guard under Duhesme and Barrois, and Domon and Subervie's Cavalry, with the addition late in the day of three battalions of the Old Guard (one each of the 2nd Grenadiers and the 1st and 2nd Chasseurs). The casualty list of these units stands as follows :

Zimmer's division	. 187	officers present,	73	killed or wounded,	or 39	p.c.
Jeannin's division	. 126	„ „	41	„ „	or 32·5	„
Young Guard	. 161[7]	„ „	34	„ „	or 21	„
Domon's cavalry	. 80[7]	„ „	30	„ „	or 37·5	„
Subervie's cavalry	. 106[7]	„ „	29	„ „	or 27·3	„

The losses of the three battalions of the Old Guard cannot be separated from those which the other battalions of their regiments suffered in the main battle. But taking the rest of Lobau's force together, we find that it lost 207 officers out of 649 present, or a percentage of 31·8. This would be considered sufficently heavy in any ordinary battle, but at Waterloo it contrasts very strongly with the awful casualty list of the divisions which were engaged with the British army, where no less than 44 per cent. of the officers present were disabled. After making all due allowance for the fact that Lobau's men were acting on the defensive, and partly protected by the buildings of Planchenoit, it still remains astounding that they should have held their own for five hours against an adversary who had at first a threefold and afterwards a sevenfold advantage in numbers. One can only conclude that the Prussian fire was far less deadly than the English—one of the many consequences of column as opposed to line-formation. It was not without reason that Soult observed to Napoleon that morning, '*Sire, l'infanterie anglaise en duel, c'est le diable.*'

Taking together all the fractions of the imperial army which were opposed to the English alone, we get the following results :—

1st Corps	. 788	officers present,	395	killed or wounded,	or 50·6	p.c.
2nd Corps	. 635[8]	„ „	240	„ „	or 37·7	„
Middle Guard	. 141[9]	„ „	73	„ „	or 51·8	„
Reserve Cavalry :						
Kellermann	. 243[8]	officers present,	118	killed or wounded,	or 48·5	p.c.
Milhaud	. 234[8]	„ „	117	„ „	or 50·0	„
Guard Cavalry	. 255[8]	„ „	69	„ „	or 27	„
Total	. 2,296	„ „	1,012	„ „	or 44	„

[7] Deduction being made of the losses of these units at the battle of Ligny and the combat of Genappe.

[8] After deducting previous losses at Quatre-Bras and Ligny.

[9] After deducting previous losses at Ligny.

I have had to leave the infantry of the Old Guard out of the calculation, as five of its battalions were engaged with the British and three with the Prussians, while M. Martinien's tables only give the losses by regiments not by battalions, so that they cannot be properly distributed between the two halves of the battle. It will be noted that the Old Guard's casualty list was only 46 officers out of 174 present, i.e. 26·4 per cent., a smaller proportional loss than that of any other unit of the French army, save the infantry of the Young Guard. The literary tradition which will have it that the famous squares of the Old Guard perished *en masse*, while covering the retreat of the emperor, is obviously erroneous. These veterans suffered far less than the line and the cavalry.

On the other hand, we note that the 1st Corps, which, after enduring the charge of the Union Brigade, maintained for the rest of the day a bitter strife with the infantry of the British left wing, lost a full half of its officers killed and wounded. If we allow for the unwounded prisoners made by the British cavalry in addition to the casualties, it is evident that much more than half of this unfortunate corps was destroyed. The cuirassiers of Milhaud and Kellermann, who delivered the great charges on Wellington's squares during the afternoon hours, also suffered a loss of about 50 per cent. So did the six battalions of the Middle Guard, with which the emperor delivered his last thrust at nightfall against Wellington's right centre.

It is somewhat surprising to find that the Guard cavalry, who joined in the same charges as the cuirassiers, show the much smaller casualty list of only some 27 per cent. This is partly, but not wholly, accounted for by the fact that the emperor retained four of the light Guard squadrons about his person till the end of the day. They were only engaged for a few minutes with Vivian's Hussars after nightfall, and can have suffered little. But, even allowing for this, the numbers lost seem small: is it possible that there is some small omission of names in M. Martinien's rolls of the lancers and chasseurs? Those of the horse-grenadiers and dragoons show a far higher proportional loss, yet we know that the light cavalry was as deeply engaged as the heavy.

The greatest individual losses in cavalry regiments at Waterloo are those of the 6th Cuirassiers, 16 officers disabled out of 20 present; the 11th Cuirassiers and 1st Carbineers lost almost as heavily in proportion. In the infantry the greatest sufferers were the 105th line, 33 casualties out of 42 present, the 45th and 25th, with 31 casualties each out of 40 and 43 respectively present—all in the 1st Corps—and then the 61st of the line of the 2nd Corps, with 17 casualties out of 27 present. The heaviest losses of the Guard infantry were in Roguet's brigade, which supplied half the column that delivered the last great attack on Wellington's right-

centre: in it 37 officers fell out of 61 present. But a score of regiments in the 1st and 2nd Corps show heavier proportional losses than this.

It only remains to speak of Grouchy's casualties at Wavre and Namur. Those at Wavre were very moderate, as might be expected from the rather slack way in which the marshal pushed the inferior Prussian force in front of him. Four of his seven infantry divisions seem hardly to have been engaged: Berthezène, Pécheux, Teste, and Hulot have only 12 officers wounded between them. The other three divisions show 16 officers killed and 51 wounded out of 472 present, a mere 14 per cent. The cavalry was lightly engaged, and shows only 15 officers hit. The marshal's total loss must have been well under 2,000 men. The combat in front of Namur on 20 June, indeed, must have been almost as serious a business, though so little is made of it in most histories. Probably the total of Grouchy's losses from 18 to 21 June may have amounted to 3,200 men, as he would seem to have lost about 162 officers in that period.

Our general estimate, therefore, of the French losses in the whole campaign is somewhat as follows:

Quatre-Bras	.	4,300 killed and wounded.
Ligny	.	10,000 „ „
Waterloo	.	29,500 „ „
„	.	7,500 prisoners unwounded
Wavre	.	1,800 killed and wounded.
Small fights	.	2,100 „ „
Total	.	55,200

These figures, as it will be seen, exceed those of M. Houssaye by some 4,000 casualties—partly owing to what I am inclined to consider his under-estimate of the loss of Ligny, partly on account of Waterloo, where I think that he is about 2,000 short, partly because of the high figure which must apparently be allowed for the small fights, more especially the combat of 20 June. As the emperor took the field with 126,000 men, he lost some 43 per cent. of his army in the week between 15 June and 22 June.

C. Oman.

Notes and Documents.

The First Campaign of Heraclius against Persia.

The study of the Armenian historians has of late years done much to increase our knowledge of the campaigns of Heraclius against Persia, but there still remain many difficulties awaiting solution. Among these the operations of the year 622 have hardly received the attention they merit. The reason for the summary treatment which they have experienced from modern students is that virtually our only authority for this campaign is George of Pisidia, and it has been easy for readers of his involved verse to absolve themselves from any detailed study by pronouncing that he was but a poet and no historian. It may, however, be answered that he was something more—an eye-witness—and that this fact is of the greatest moment. In this paper we shall attempt to understand the account given us in the *Expeditio Persica*, assuming that even the words of a poet are usually intended to be susceptible of some meaning.

The object of the first campaign of Heraclius against Persia is in fact, despite oft-repeated misconceptions, quite clear: it was to force the Persian to withdraw from Asia Minor. The plan of campaign was not to engage the enemy, but, passing him on his flank, to threaten his communications and to appear to be striking at the very heart of his native country. The operations were in the result completely successful.

On 4 April 622 Heraclius celebrated a public communion.[1] On the following day he summoned Sergius, the patriarch, Bonus (or Bonosus), the magister, together with the senate, the principal officials, and the entire populace of the capital.[2] Turning to Sergius he said, 'Into the hands of God and of his mother and into thine I commend this city and my son.' After solemn prayer in the cathedral the emperor took the sacred image of the Saviour and bore it from the church in his arms. The troops then embarked, and in the evening of the same day (5 April) the fleet set sail. They passed Chalcedon, now in all likelihood occupied by

[1] *Exp. Pers.* i. 132 ff. [2] Theoph. p. 466 (Bonn ed.); Niceph. p. 17 (Bonn).

the Persians, and coasted round the promontory of the Heraeum.[3] Here the pagan name was changed, and Heraclius gave the headland a Christian title, probably dedicating it, as Drapeyron suggests, to the Virgin Mary: the chief goddess of the old pantheon would be displaced by the flower of womanhood in the new faith. A strong wind, however, sprang up from the south and blew in the teeth of the fleet, while a heavy cloud-rack hid all the stars. The emperor's ship ran on a reef, and it was only through his own enthusiasm that she was eventually saved from being dashed to pieces. The sailors, fastening cables to the boat, dragged her free once more,[4] and the Romans continued their voyage without further mishap. Heraclius, 'the swift courser of a day,'[5] arrived at the small town of Pylae, in the Bay of Nicomedia, and there cast anchor without delay or opposition.[6]

Dr. A. J. Butler, in his recent work on *The Arab Conquest of Egypt*, has returned to the identification of Quercius, which was adopted by Gibbon and all subsequent historians down to Tafel's time.[7] He writes: 'The Roman force landed and camped at Issus and seized the pass of Pylae, on the frontier between Cilicia and Syria. . . . The expedition to Cilicia drove a wedge into the very centre of the vast territory between the Nile and the Bosporus, now controlled by the Persians.'[8] But the contention of Tafel[9] that this account is impossible must, I think, be admitted without hesitation. His arguments may be summarised as follows:—

(i.) George of Pisidia gives no geographical position to the place; it must therefore be not only known to the citizens but near the capital.

(ii.) No place is mentioned after the turning of the promontory of the Heraeum.[10]

(iii.) Terms like λεγόμεναι are not used of famous places, but applied to towns, &c., which are more or less obscure.

(iv.) The words of George of Pisidia, which are in themselves conclusive:

> ἕως διελθὼν τὴν ὁδὸν τῶν ῥευμάτων
> αὐταῖς ἐπέστης ταῖς καλουμέναις Πύλαις
> ἐλθὼν ἀπροσδόκητος ἡμεροδρόμος.

(v.) While no one could *sail* to the Cilician Gates[11] the sea

[3] *Exp. Pers.* i. 156–7.

[4] *Ibid.* i. *passim.*

[5] Ἐλθὼν ἀπροσδόκητος ἡμεροδρόμος (*ibid.* ii. 11).

[6] Ἀπάρας δὲ τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως ἐξῆλθεν κατὰ τὰς λεγομένας Πύλας πλοῖ τὴν πορείαν ποιησάμενος (Theoph. p. 466; cf. *Exp. Pers.* ii. 10.)

[7] See Professor Bury's edition of Gibbon, v. 79, n. 97.—Ed. *E. H. R.*

[8] P. 124.

[9] *Theophanis Chronographia; Probe einer neuen kritisch-exegetischen Ausgabe* (1852), p. 146 *sqq.*

[10] Drapeyron clearly felt this difficulty (*L'Empereur Héraclius*, p. 154).

[11] 'Pylas autem Ciliciae *intus* situs *navibus* nemo mortalium adit ut hinc in Armeniam superiorem . . . perveniat' (Tafel, p. 149).

passage through the Nicomedian Bay avoided a circuitous coast road.

Gerland[12] has seen an additional argument for Tafel's view in the fact that a south wind blew in the teeth of the fleet: Νότου πνεύσαντος εἰς τοὐναντίον.[13] This would clearly, however, apply equally well if the troops were on their voyage either to the Bithynian or Cilician Pylae. It could be quoted as rendering an identification with the Caspian Pylae impossible, but I am not aware that the latter have ever been seriously suggested in this connexion. There is, however, one other point of importance to be noticed. Pylae was precisely the spot at which the emperors were accustomed to land when going to the east.[14] In the *De Cerimoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus the proper formalities to be observed on such a disembarkation are detailed.[15] Dr. Butler supports the old view by a passage of Sepeos, according to whom 'there was a drawn battle close to Antioch city, with great slaughter on both sides. But the Romans retreated to Pylae, where they defeated the Persians, who, however, recovered and took Tarsus and all Cilicia.'[16] But Sepeos has no chronological framework,[17] and in his account the whole Persian war is apparently fought out in a single campaign. I would suggest that he is here describing events which should be referred to the spring of 626, when Heraclius had undoubtedly marched into Cilicia.

From Pylae the emperor proceeded, Theophanes tells us,[18] 'into the region of the themes,' by which he must mean the heart of Asia Minor, probably Galatia and perhaps Cappadocia. Remembering the march of Philippicus and the route pursued in Heraclius's own second campaign,[19] we might conclude that he now halted at Caesarea, in Cappadocia. To this spot the army was to be collected, and veterans and recruits welded into one force. Speed was necessary and the greatest vigilance, or else the enemy might cut off small sections of the scattered troops and sever them from the main body. But the concentration was carried out successfully,[20] and the several mountain streams helped to form

[12] 'Die persische Feldzüge des Kaisers Herakleios,' in the *Byz. Zeitschr.* iii. 341.
[13] *Exp. Pers.* i. 170.
[14] Cf. Ramsay, *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 187.
[15] *De Cerim.* i. 474, 493; Ramsay, *op. cit.* p. 201.
[16] Butler, *op. cit.* p. 124.
[17] Gerland, *ubi supra*, p. 335.
[18] Ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν θεμάτων χώρας ἀφικόμενος (Theoph. p. 466).
[19] Sepêos, cap. 26.
[20] Ὅμως συνῆλθον, Geo. Pisid. *Exp. Pers.* ii. 66; cf. *Heraclias*, ii. 153:

ἠβουλόμην δὲ καίπερ ὢν βραδύγραφος
τὴν συλλογήν σου τῶν στρατευμάτων γράφειν.
τὴν εἰς ἅπαν γῆς ἐσκεδασμένον μέρος
βούλαις δὲ ταῖς σαῖς ἐν βραχεῖ συνηγμένην·
οἱ σοὶ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἦγον ἐκτικοὶ λόγοι
ὡς εἴ τις ἄλλος ἐκ μίας ὑδραγώγου
σύρει τὰ χρυσᾶ συλλέγων σταφύγματα.

that river which was to overflow the Persian land.[21] As Theophanes says, 'he collected the garrisons, and added to their number his young army.'[22] George does not cease to wonder at the way in which the emperor kept all his plans clear and distinct from each other, despite their multiplicity,[23] or at the resource and adaptability he showed in devising others when one failed, or in strengthening a scheme insufficiently developed.[24] After the troops had been thoroughly drilled and exercised in mimic combats,[25] Heraclius continued his march. The first aggressive operation was to send out skirmishing parties of picked horsemen. These captured many small bands of the enemy who were ravaging the country-side. The leaders were set at liberty, and the emperor's motto, 'Pardon rather than the sword,' brought, we are told, many even of 'the faithless barbarians' to his side.[26]

Heraclius had, apparently, down to this time been pursuing a line of march running due east from Caesarea—that is to say, through the north of Cappadocia. Thus the capture of a Saracen leader is said by Theophanes to have taken place when the emperor was drawing near to the districts on the frontier of Armenia.[27] He does not say—as some have translated him—that the emperor was *in* Armenia, where he certainly was not.[28] Heraclius now struck in a north-easterly direction into the province of Pontus. The summer was over; before the Romans lay the mountains and the forces of the enemy. The passes had been seized by the Persians; the road to the east was blocked. Sarbar intended to keep Heraclius where he now was during the winter, and to besiege his quarters in Pontus.[29]

[21] *Exp. Pers.* ii. 66–9.

[22] Theoph. *loc. cit.*

[23] *Exp. Pers.* ii. 70 ff.

[24] *Ibid.* ii. 60 ff.

[25] The poet assures us that he was anxious to see the pleasant prelude of the war, but that this mock battle was a most terrible sight.

[26] Geo. Pisid. *Exp. Pers.* ii. 235–238.

[27] Γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη Ἀρμενίας (Theoph. p. 468). Gerland appears (p. 347) to think this barely possible.

[28] Theophanes, p. 469, makes this quite clear when he says of Sarbar, Φοβηθεὶς μὴ διὰ τῆς Ἀρμενίας εἰς τὴν Περσίδα ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰσβαλὼν ταύτην ταράξῃ. From the narrative itself we see that the words εἰς τὴν Περσίδα εἰσβάλλει must be regarded as an expression of direction; as such they are correct. To the Persians who had been outmanœuvred he seemed to be striking at their country (*contra* Tafel, p. 55, note on l. 13).

[29] Cedrenus, i. 720: ἀποκλίνας ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς τὸ τοῦ Ποντίου κλίμα. Geo. Pisid. *Exp. Pers.* ii. 256:

> ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἰς χειμῶνα πρὸς τὸ πόντιον
> κλίμα διατρίψας συντόμως ὁ βάρβαρος
> τὰς εἰσβολὰς κατέσχε τῆς ὁδοῦ φθάσας.

Read with Tafel Πόντιον and διέτριψας. Manuscripts of Theophanes, p. 468, have ἀποκλείσας, 'absque sensu,' says Tafel. We should read ἀποκλίνας, *i.e.* he strikes north-east. I adopt (following De Boor) the interpretation of the *Hist. Misc.*: 'visum est barbaris obsidere illum in hoc hiemantem.' A manuscript of Theophanes has ἔδοξε τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐν τούτῳ αὐτὸν παραχειμάζειν, for which Tafel reads, ἔδοξε τοῖς βαρβάροις πολιορκεῖν

Heraclius was thus forced to adopt a stratagem in order to turn the enemy's position. For this manœuvre our only authority is George of Pisidia.[30] The obscurity of his description has, however, deterred historians from any detailed consideration of the passage.[31] The fighting was evidently very slight. In fact the poet is most anxious that we should understand that the operation was a successful feint: *ἐπαινετὴ πλαστουργία, σοφὴ πλαστουργία, σοφὴ ὑπόκρισις, τοῦτο τὸ ποικίλον, εὐμηχάνως* (not *ἀνδρείως*, or the like), &c. The enemy were entrenched in a strong position, and were determined not to abandon it. At the same time they would be keeping a keen watch over the movements of the Roman army. To divert their attention Heraclius in person made a sudden frontal attack,[32] as though about to storm the passes to the east. Meanwhile the army, under cover of this diversion, probably marched to the north, and soon struck east, where they got possession of the hills, either meeting no force of the enemy or preventing any from escaping. The Persians, thinking that the body led by the emperor was the main force, came out from their entrenchments.[33] Immediately Heraclius, as though finding a more serious opposition than he had expected, gave the signal for retreat. The Persians, knowing the love for feints which was proverbial in Byzantine military tactics, were afraid to pursue to any distance, fearing that they might lose their position by a secret flanking attack, and accordingly retired to their fortified encampment (*ἐκ σου σκελισθεὶς δυστυχῶς ὑποστρέφει*). As, however, the Roman army did not return to the attack, the Persians, concluding that it was as demoralised as its predecessors, relaxed all vigilance, and Heraclius was able to follow in the track of his main force.[34]

ἐν τούτῳ αὐτὸν παραχειμάζοντα. If we accept the reading of the manuscript we must take it as an excuse for the ease with which Heraclius turned the Persian position.

[30] I am not aware that any writer has attempted to explain this passage of George. Le Beau does not mention it; Drapeyron's account (p. 170) is even more mysterious than the Greek original; Gerland (p. 347) simply gives the result of the manœuvre and does not hazard a suggestion as to method; Tafel has no note on the subject, and the general historians are silent. Professor Bury's remarks (*Later Roman Empire*, ii. 228, note 3) are useful, but he was at that time (1889) apparently unaware of Tafel's work. It is noticeable that the movement cannot be explained even by such a formation as an *oblique échelon*, for the flanking movement was not only *unsuspected* by the enemy but absolutely unknown to them, which implies a wider *détour* than a mere formation in *échelon*.

[31] Geo. Pisid. *Exp. Pers.* ii. 256 *sqq*.

[32] This is apparently the meaning of *ἐκδρομὴ* in l. 264.

[33] Cf. *ἐξωρμηκότος, προεκτρέχειν*.

[34] I retain the manuscript text in ll. 276, 277, *καὶ τοῦτο μᾶλλον τοῦ σκοποῦ τὸ ποικίλον τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνῆκεν εἰς ῥᾳθυμίαν*. Tafel says it reads 'inepte,' and emends *ἀθυμίαν*. But the poet clearly implies that the Persians considered themselves victorious; why *ἀθυμία*? Theophanes has preserved the true word (*λαθὼν δὲ τοὺς Πέρσας καὶ ἐπιστραφεὶς εἰς τὴν Περσίδα εἰσβάλλει. Τοῦτο μαθόντες οἱ βάρβαροι εἰς ῥᾳθυμίαν ἦλθον τῷ ἀπροσδοκήτῳ τῆς τούτου εἰσοδοῦ*), but in his abbreviated form has missed the

Thus at the time of the feint his army was marching *διπροσώπῳ σχήματι* (*i.e.* east and north), and on his retreat the emperor, from being leader of the van, at once took the second place in the line of march (*καὶ πρῶτος εὐθὺς ἠρίθης ὁ δεύτερος*). Formerly he had been going almost at right angles to the direction taken by the army (*τὰς ἡνίας λόξας προδείκνυς*), but turning [35] he went straight after his force (*ὀξέως παρέρχεται*); and, taking up a position exactly opposite to that previously held (*ἐξ ἀντιστρόφου, εἰς ἀντιστάδην*),[36] had thus passed the enemy on their right flank [37] (*παρέρχεται, παρῆλθε*). George sums up the operation thus:—

> *καὶ τὸν παραβάτην βαλὼν πλασμῷ ξένῳ*
> *πρὸ τῆς μάχης ἀφῆκας εἰς ἀντιστάδην.*

These lines have been hopelessly misunderstood. The note in the Bonn edition opens thus:—

> Παραβάτην duplici sensu vocat Persam tum quia locum aptiorem ad pugnam praeoccupaverat, tum etiam quia a religione Christiana defecerat. Παραβάτης enim est tam is qui currum moderans alios praevertit quam qui legem violavit.

In the first place it is, I think, clear that the word *παραβάτης* means 'transgressor,' and that alone. Elsewhere George applies the same term to Chosroes: *ὡς καθεῖλες* (*τὸν*) *παραβάτην Χοσρόην*.[38] Indeed, the *παραβάτης* is he who stands beside the warrior in the *battle* chariot, and has no connexion with skill in *chariot-racing*. In the second place we are not to read *πλαστῷ ξένῳ* (with Kusterus), and certainly neither to translate *et transgressorem coniectum in planitiem ignotam ante pugnam in adversam partem compulisti* nor *Parabaten cum ficto hospite committens ante pugnam in adversarium* (*ἀντιστάτην*, Suidas) *immisisti*. We must deny that *πλασμὸς idem est ac πλατυσμὸς, planities*. *πλασμὸς* (*πλάζω*) is, in fact, only another word for *πλαστουργία*.[39] *πλασμὸς ξένος* is the newly invented stratagem of the emperor. As for the reading [40] to be adopted, the manuscript of George of Pisidia has *καὶ τὸν παραβάτην βαλὼν πλασμῷ ξένῳ κ.τ.λ.* Those of Suidas have *τὸν πᾰρᾰβᾰ́την παραβαλὼν*, or *συμβαλὼν*, or *τὴν πᾰρᾰβᾰ́σιν συμβαλὼν*. I believe that we have here one of those verbal conceits which are of such frequent

precise meaning of the poet. The *Historia Miscella* reads 'in rancorem . . . devenerunt.' Tafel proposes 'angorem;' I would suggest 'languorem' (= *ῥᾳθυμίαν*)

[35] In l. 283 I read *ὑποστρέφων* with all the editions.

[36] This latter phrase must here mean 'opposite' and not 'in hand-to-hand fight,' as Liddell and Scott.

[37] If, as is probable, he marched to the north of the enemy's position.

[38] *Heracl.* i. 206.

[39] Cf. *ὑφανετὴ πλαστουργία, σοφὴ πλαστουργία*, above, p. 698.

[40] See Hilberg, *Wiener Studien*, ix. 211.

occurrence in the poems of George. I suggest that we should read—

τῷ παραβατῇ γὰρ συμβαλών, πλασμῳ ξένῳ
πρὸ τῆς μάχης ἀφῆκας εἰς ἀντιστάδην,

i.e. 'for though you had engaged with the transgressor, yet *before the fight*, by a novel stratagem, you reversed the relative position of the two armies.'

The enemy, having retired to their entrenchments, made no further movement, but waited quietly for six days. It was only then[41] that the unexpected report was brought them that the emperor had outflanked them and was now in their rear. As George says,[42] it was a matter of the greatest import to the Persians that the Roman army should have gained this advantage. The country lying between the hostile forces was mountainous and difficult; the Persians themselves were invaders, who could only look for opposition from the native population; they were threatened by famine, as the Romans could carry off all provisions in the line of march; they would be forced to be continually on their guard against ambushes in the rough districts of Pontus towards the east, while all the most favourable positions would be seized in advance by the imperial army. While Heraclius apparently marched east at a leisurely pace, Sarbar was at a loss to know what policy to adopt. At first he determined to follow hard on the tracks of the emperor, to overtake him and fight a battle forthwith. But should he suffer a reverse in such country his retreat would be beset with dangers and difficulties. Rather would he turn southwards; by so doing he would draw off the emperor from Pontus; by rendering him anxious for his southern provinces he would turn the Roman into the pursuer and would frustrate his well-planned strategy. Sarbar set out accordingly for Cilicia. The Persian tactics, however, met with signal failure. Heraclius refused to abandon the position he had won, while the Roman fleets were undisputed masters of the Euxine and the Archipelago. Once more Sarbar hesitated. He suddenly realised that since his southern march the passes into Armenia were left unguarded. What if the enemy should thus strike at the very heart of Persia? 'And so he leapt from one plan to another like a rolling stone, which, falling down a precipice, crashes on to a projecting point and rebounds, only to be tossed back from the opposing crag.'[43]

But the prospect of the emperor entering Armenia unopposed was insupportable, and so at last the Persian general determined

[41] Geo. Pisid. *Exp. Pers.* ii. 286.

[42] *Ibid.* l. 293 ff. Drapeyron (p. 170) is clearly in error in his explanation of these lines, which show a keen perception of the real strategic importance of the emperor's manœuvre.

[43] *Ibid.* ll. 338–56.

to march north-east, through Cappadocia, into the region of the upper streams of the Halys. He was thus dragged after the emperor against his will, like a dog on a chain, as George vividly puts it.[44] But while Heraclius had improved his position, and had inspired the new Roman army with his own enthusiasm, the Persian troops were disheartened by their arduous and fruitless manœuvres. Clinging to the hills, they feared to venture on an open assault upon the imperial camp, pitched in the plain below. Sarbar had planned a secret attack under cover of darkness, but the moon was nearly at the full, and the clear wintry nights were cloudless. An eclipse of the moon when the attempt was on the point of being made further discouraged the enemy (23 Jan. 623). Thus passed fifteen days. The Persians were rapidly becoming demoralised; constant skirmishes invariably resulted in a victory for the Romans, the emperor himself 'doing all things instead of all before the whole host,' while deserters brought news of the desperate state of affairs in the Persian camp. Sarbar was forced to take the decisive step. Just before dawn he drew up his forces in three divisions facing the imperial position. A picked body of men, however, he had set in ambush on the wing between the two armies. They were fully concealed by the hollows of the broken country in which the battle was fought; during the engagement they were to charge upon the Roman flank and throw it into confusion. Sarbar's hope was that as it had been in the past so would it be now. But 'the times of cowardice were past;' before the night was half over Heraclius was aware of the danger and took his measures to guard against it. He also drew up his army in three divisions to meet the disposition of the enemy, and himself took the initiative by sending out a body of men 'armed rather with good counsels than with weapons.' As soon as they were on a line with the ambuscade they made a feigned retreat, as though terror-stricken by the strength of their opponents. The Persians in hiding, thinking this to be the very moment to strike, poured out upon the supposed fugitives. Relying rather on the surprise and suddenness of their onset than on order or combination, they found drawn up against them the three divisions of the Roman force. Heraclius immediately led out a body of his most trusted soldiers, and the Persians, themselves ensnared, broke and fled. When Sarbar ordered a general advance it was too late: the army was seized with sudden panic. In the utter rout which ensued but few escaped.[45] The Romans fearlessly entered the Persian camp, and did not even strike the enemy's tents, but wherever a man found a shelter still standing he left the canvas as it was and appropriated

[44] Geo. Pisid. *Exp. Pers.* l. 357–8.

[45] Σφάζουσι δὲ ἅπαν τὸ Περσικὸν πλῆθος ὀλίγων τινῶν διαδράντων. (Cedr.)

the spoil.[46] Thus ended the first campaign of Heraclius against Persia. The army went into winter quarters; the emperor set out for Byzantium, and with him went the poet to whom we owe the *Expeditio Persica*.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

London and the Commune.

THE word 'commune,' as is well known, was used in the middle ages, like many words in the feudal vocabulary, both in a vague, popular sense and in one strictly defined and technical. In the former sense it might be applied to any union of citizens for the purpose of securing freer conditions of local government; in the latter it was applied only to a town that was formally constituted in its corporate capacity a feudal person, a vassal of its lord, a lord perhaps of other vassals, with the rights, obligations, and freedom of that station in the feudal society, a *seigneurie collective populaire*, as it has been termed by Luchaire.[1] That London was called a commune in the former sense has long been known.[2] The most interesting of the early instances of the fact is the passage in William of Malmesbury where, in recording the events of 1141, he mentions *omnes barones qui in eorum communionem iamdudum recepti fuerant*.[3] The question whether London was ever a commune in the stricter sense has been raised by Mr. J. H. Round in connexion with the events that occurred there in 1191 and the light thrown on them by two documents of a little later date which he has printed for the first time.[4] The language of the chroniclers in describing the occurrences of 1191 clearly indicate that with reference to a commune of London something unusual was done,

[46] The lines of George are as follows (*Exp. Pers.* iii. 281, 899):—

πάντες γὰρ οἱ πρὶν μήδε Περσικὴν κόνιν
ἰδεῖν στέγοντες, οὐδὲ τὰς σκηνὰς τότε
καθεῖλον ἀλλ' ἕκαστος ἦν εἶχε σκέπην
οὕτως ἀφῆκεν ὅσπερ ἦν πεπηγμένη.

I believe that the poet is here speaking of the occupation by the Romans of the Persian camp; and he was thus understood by Theophanes. Quercius refers *σκηνάς* to the Romans' own tents, which, usually struck before a battle, were, he thinks, on this occasion left standing. The interpretation is improbable; it is the sense of security *after* the victory of which George is speaking, not of that *before* the battle. Further we must not translate *σκέπη* with Quercius by 'scutum' or 'armatura.' It means simply 'shade.' The Romans after an arduous pursuit come back spent and weary; nearer than their own camp, on the flank of the hill is that of the Persians. So great was the assurance of their complete safety that the soldiers, not troubling to dismantle the enemy's camp, occupied it, and any shelter from the midday sun which each man discovered he left standing as it was and turned to his own use.

[1] *Communes Françaises*, p. 97.

[2] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* i. 407, first ed.

[3] *Hist. Nov.* c. 495.

[4] *The Commune of London, and other Studies* (1899), pp. 219 ff.

some step was taken that had never been taken before.[5] The language of Richard of Devizes admits of no other interpretation, and, while it is perhaps possible that he might have used the same language of a concession of local independence to London which would fall considerably below a strict commune, the reference to Richard and Henry and the mention of the oath taken to the commune by John, who probably assumed to be acting for the crown, make such an interpretation unlikely. The most natural supposition is that John granted to London the position of a crown vassal with all the privileges which that would carry with it. As, however, this interpretation of the language of Richard of Devizes is not beyond question, and as our evidence from the following period leaves the status of the city somewhat in doubt, it is worth while to analyse such evidence as we have to see if the doubt can be removed.

1. In 1894 in his *Leges Anglorum* Dr. Liebermann called attention to the fact that Addit. MS. 14252 of the British Museum gave evidence of the existence of a mayor and *skivini* in London under Richard and John.[6] The documents which embody this evidence, important in themselves, are those referred to above as published by Mr. Round in his *Commune of London*. Mr. Round's essay seems to imply that he regarded the conclusive proof that he presented of the existence of these officers in London as equally proof of the establishment of a commune by the act of 1191 as something different from the earlier commune in the vague sense, but it is certain, I think, that neither mayor nor *skivini* were officers typical of the commune in the technical sense. They existed in towns not recognised as legally communes.[7] And while the interesting evidence that Mr. Round presented in the same essay of the derivation of the London organisation from Rouen makes the existence of a commune more likely it is not conclusive. Both Rouen itself and the towns that adopted its institutions were imperfect communes, allowing unusual powers to the suzerain,[8] and it is quite possible that London might have borrowed these officers from Rouen without objection from the king and without obtaining therewith recognition as a crown vassal.

[5] The passages of chief importance are these: 'Johannes comes frater regis et archiepiscopus Rothomagensis, et omnes episcopi, comites, et barones regni qui aderant, concesserunt civibus Londoniarum communam suam, et juraverunt quod ipsi eam et dignitates civitatis Londoniarum custodirent illibatas, quamdiu regi placuerit (*Gesta*, ii. 214).

'Concessa est ipsa die et instituta communia Londoniensium, in quam universi regni magnates et ipsi etiam ipsius provinciae episcopi jurare coguntur. Nunc primum in indulta sibi conjuratione regno regem deesse cognovit Londonia, quam nec rex ipse Ricardus, nec praedecessor et pater ejus Henricus, pro mille millibus marcarum argenti fieri permisisset' (Richard of Devizes, *Chronicles of Stephen*, &c., iii. 416).

[6] *Leges Angl.* pp. 18 and 83.

[7] Luchaire, *Communes*, p. 176; *Manuel des Institutions Françaises*, pp. 404–5.

[8] Luchaire, *Manuel*, p. 402, n. 1; *Communes*, p. 102.

2. If John, even as representing the crown, granted a commune to London in the strict sense, it is by no means certain that Richard on his return would have felt himself bound by that grant. No act of royal prerogative is more common in the feudal age than the disavowal and revoking by one king of his predecessor's grants from the crown domain, at least when these have been made under circumstances which put the crown at a disadvantage, and the grant of a commune to London, legally considered, would be a grant from the crown domain. The words of Richard of Devizes seem like a well-informed judgment of what Richard's attitude in the matter would be, and our general knowledge of that king's character makes it seem unlikely that he would have hesitated to refuse his sanction to his brother's act.

3. This supposition receives some confirmation from the absence of all reference to a commune in the charter of Richard to the city of 23 April 1194,[9] as well as from the use of the ordinary form of expression *pro libertatibus suis conservandis* in the entry in the Pipe Roll of 1195,[10] where the Londoners' payment of 1,000*l.* to the king is recorded. The conclusion is fairly certain that Richard recognised no commune, for it is hardly possible to suppose that a relationship to the crown so exceptional, so far as English towns are concerned, would have escaped some kind of notice had it existed. In line with this are John's charter of confirmation of 17 June 1199,[11] and his grant of the shrievalty to the citizens on 5 July of the same year.[12] The citizens might indeed have wished to buy the shrievalty even if they had had a commune, for, embracing the county of Middlesex, it would be wider than the commune; but it may rightly excite suspicion because, with a commune in the strict sense, their interest in the shrievalty would be greatly reduced.

4. From 1215 comes a piece of evidence interesting in the suggestion it makes but exasperating in its incompleteness.[13] In the charter of 9 May, which John issued to the city as his trouble with the barons was approaching a crisis, the mayor is required to swear allegiance to the king. If we had a record of the form of oath to be taken by the mayor under this charter, it is quite likely that our problem would be solved, so far at least as this particular date is concerned. If he took an oath of fealty to the king in the name of the city, and as representing it in its vassal capacity, London was a commune; if he took it merely as an officer of the city, the same oath which other officers took at the same time, it was not. The language of the charter looks like

[9] *Liber Custumarum*, p. 248.

[10] *Commune of London*, p. 234; cf Madox, *Exchequer*, i. 473, n. *t* [p. 327, n. t, ed. 1711].

[11] *Foedera*, i. p. 76; cf. charter of Henry III, *Lib. Custumarum*, p. 45.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 249; cf. *Engl. Hist. Rev.* xvii. 508.

[13] See Miss Bateson in the *Engl. Hist. Rev.* xvii. 726.

the former case, and suggests that the king may be tempting the city with the hope of a restoration of the commune to which he had once sworn, but not so clearly as to exclude the other possibility.

5. Clause 12 of Magna Carta has the appearance of deciding the question. London is there classed with the crown vassals, and its tax payments are called *auxilia*. A comparison of this clause with clause 32 of the Articles of the Barons shows, I think with great probability, that this exact point was clearly in mind and that the language was used intentionally. The earlier article says, *Simili modo fiat de taillagiis et auxiliis de civitate Londoniarum, et de aliis civitatibus quae inde habent libertates*—evidently a careless phrase and an extension of the privilege that could be justified legally by no precedents in favour of the towns included. To have inserted it in the final charter would have been to demand a large concession from the crown, and to demand new grants is not in the general spirit of Magna Carta. The demand for London might be justified if John himself had once sworn to its commune, but there were no grounds on which it could be claimed for any other town. As Magna Carta in general, and in comparison with the Articles of the Barons, is a carefully drawn document, this explanation of the difference between the two clauses is not improbable. It seems possible then to conclude that in clause 12 of Magna Carta the crown, in indirect terms at least, recognised London as a commune in the strict sense.[14]

6. The first piece of evidence that is conclusive comes to us from the reign of Henry III and from his 39th year. In that year, according to the record of the case then made,[15] the king by order of the council ordered a tallage of his domains to meet the expenses of his campaign abroad. As a part of the domain the citizens of London were summoned before the king and council and informed that 3,000 marks was asked of them *nomine tallagii*. The mayor and others who had appeared for the city took counsel together and offered 2,000 *nomine auxilii*, and declared flatly (*praecise*) that they could not and would not give more. Then the king sent his treasurer and others of the council to London to receive the sum demanded, with instructions, if the city would not pay it, to assess it themselves upon the citizens individually; but the king's messengers found not merely that the city refused to pay the tax, but that the citizens refused to take the oaths demanded of them to fix the assessments of one another, and they had to go away *infecto negotio illo*. Then the matter came before the king's council

[14] A grant of freedom from tallage merely would not be equivalent to the grant of a commune, nor evidence of its existence. Clause 12, however, seems clearly to class London with the vassals of the crown, and the payment of *auxilia* seems to be claimed as a right rather than asked as a concession.

[15] Madox, *Exchequer*, i. 712, n. *a* [p. 491, n. *a*, ed. 1711].

at Westminster on the issue of fact created by the claim of the city. *Et cum contencio esset, utrum hoc dici deberet tallagium vel auxilium, rex scrutari fecit rotulos suos, utrum ipsi aliquid dederunt regi vel antecessoribus suis nomine tallagii. Et scrutatis rotulis compertum est tam in rotulis de Scaccario quam de Cancellaria* that in the 16th of John and in the 7th, 26th, and 37th of Henry III the city had been tallaged and had paid the tax. That settled the case. *Postea in crastino . . . venerunt praedicti Radulfus maior et cives et recognoverunt se esse talliabiles, et dederunt regi tria millia marcaram pro tallagio.* Now both *tallagium* and *auxilium* are words used in a vague as well as in a technical sense, but it is not possible to suppose that anything but the strict technical distinction between them is here meant by the claim which London advances. The city asserts that it is not a part of the king's domain, that it should pay *auxilia*, like a vassal, and not *tallagia*, like a villain. The precedents are examined; they prove to be clearly against the city—if the council had had a copy of Madox's *Exchequer* they could have increased the number;—and the city is obliged to withdraw its claim and to confess itself a domain town. The bearing of the case is so clear, indeed, that we cannot believe that the crown as such had ever recognised London as a true commune, not even as a consequence of the act of John in 1191, or that the claim of London in Magna Carta had been made good.

In view of all the evidence I am inclined to suggest these conclusions: John in 1191, assuming to represent the crown, granted to London a commune in the legal sense, and under this arrangement the mayor and *skivini* constitution was introduced. Richard on his return refused to confirm this grant, though this refusal did not modify the city's constitution, and John as king continued Richard's policy. In 1215 he needed the city's support and bid for it with the charter of 9 May, in which it is possible, though only barely possible, that he meant to hold out the prospect of a re-establishment of the commune. In Magna Carta a few weeks later the city put forward its own programme, with the support of the barons asserted its legal right to the commune, and compelled the king to recognise it, hoping in this way to establish it. On the reissue of the charter after the death of John clause 12 was omitted, and with it London's legal right to a commune fell to the ground.[16]

GEORGE B. ADAMS.

[16] Possibly the reference to London, along with that to scutage, was one of the *dubitabilia* said in the reissue of 1217 to have led to the omission of that clause. We must regard its insertion in the clause, I think, as an assertion of London's claim and programme, and not of a legal right that the crown was likely to admit.

King John and Robert Fitzwalter.

THE study of feudal genealogy is apt to be somewhat neglected by historians, although for at least a century and a half after the Norman Conquest its close connexion with territorial power makes it constantly of importance.

We all know that Robert Fitzwalter was the leader of the barons' host in the struggle for the Great Charter, and we also know that Geoffrey de Mandeville, earl of Essex, was one of the king's most ardent opponents; but the connexion between these two men has been till recently unknown, and the actual territorial position of Robert himself appears to be imperfectly grasped.

Although the *Histoire des Ducs de Normandie* was published by the Société de l'Histoire de France so far back as 1840, it was not, I believe, till Miss Norgate laid stress, in her *John Lackland*, on the authority of its writer as 'one of the best, and certainly the most impartial, of our informants on the closing years of John's reign' that its value for English history was recognised. Certainly the fact, which it states, that Geoffrey, earl of Essex, married the elder daughter of Robert Fitzwalter will be sought for in vain in English peerage books, and appears to have been quite unsuspected. The statement, however, is very precise and is directly connected by the author with the quarrel between the king and Robert. Not only is it asserted on pp. 112 and 117; on p. 119 we have this precise statement on Robert Fitzwalter:

> Il avoit ij filles et j fill; li aisnee des filles, si comme vous avés oï, fu mariée à Joffroi de Mandeville, et l'autre fu encore petite puciele; mais puis fu-elle mariée à Guillaume de Mandeville, qui freres fu Joffroi; mais puisnés estoit de lui.

It is well ascertained that William, earl of Essex, who succeeded his brother Geoffrey, married Christina, a daughter of Robert Fitzwalter, and I accept, therefore, as correct this statement that his elder brother had married her elder sister, even though I do not know of any other evidence for the fact.

The name of the daughter who married Geoffrey is, unfortunately, not given, so that we cannot tell whether it was Maud, the name given in the Dunmow story as that of John's victim. But I would point out that the known fact of Geoffrey being given to wife, at the beginning of 1214, John's 'divorced' wife Isabel proves that his previous wife must then have been dead, and that she cannot have long survived John's quarrel with her father. Robert Fitzwalter retained his influence with the Mandevilles by the marriage of his other daughter with Geoffrey's brother William, who acted, when earl, in close conjunction with him in 1216. Geoffrey's second marriage in 1214 is a curiously difficult matter. So different

are the impressions that the evidence is capable of conveying that, in two works appearing simultaneously, we find Miss Norgate writing of John's scheme 'for conciliating him by marrying him to the greatest heiress in England,' the countess of Gloucester,[1] while Sir James Ramsay asserts that Geoffrey was 'forced, much against his will, to take to wife the king's discarded Isabel of Gloucester.'[2] What is certain is that he promised the great sum of 20,000 marcs for her marriage, to raise which he is said to have been forced to mortgage manors and cut down woods. Sir James, who has studied the Pipe Rolls of the reign, considers that John 'compelled Geoffrey de Mandeville, the earl of Essex, to marry her, in order to obtain from him an impossible fine, one that he could never pay; the marriage was simply a device for turning the Gloucester estates into money.'[3]

It is a good illustration of the doubt in which even the simplest facts are involved that the marriage of one of the greatest men of his day in England, Hubert de Burgh, to this great heiress, Countess Isabel, who became the widow of the earl of Essex in February 1216, has been questioned. In the latest work of reference, *The Complete Peerage*, the marriage is asserted in vol. iii. p. 281,[4] under 'Essex,' where we are referred to 'Gloucester,' under which (iv. 40) we read that, on the contrary, 'her (often alleged) re-marriage with Hubert de Burgh is a mistake arising out of her lands having been committed to his custody (as justiciar of England) in consequence of Earl Geoffrey having died in rebellion.' Now this 'Gloucester' article is based on a good authority, Mr. Gough Nichols's paper on the earldom in the Bristol volume of the Archæological Institute (1851). Mr. Nichols certainly denies the marriage with Hubert, but he vouches Foss's *Judges* as his authority for doing so. Turning to this useful work as the ultimate source of the denial, we find that what Foss really urged, and rightly urged, was that the authority cited by Dugdale,[5] namely an entry on the Close Roll of Henry III., did not state or imply marriage, but only the custody of the lands (ii. 277). He closes his remarks, however, by observing that 'her union with him may have occurred shortly afterwards, but could only have been of short duration. The date of her death is not mentioned.' I can find no record evidence of her marriage, but the chronicles show that it must have taken place; for, of the charges subsequently brought

[1] *John Lackland*, p. 196. The dealings of Henry II with the Gloucester inheritance should be noted as a remarkable illustration of 'the king's prerogative right' to bestow an entire fief on an unmarried daughter and co-heiress to the exclusion of her married sisters. Compare the *History of English Law* (1895), ii. 273, where, however, the only example given is that of the Mandeville fief from my *Ancient Charters*.

[2] *The Angevin Empire*, p 470. [3] *Ibid.* p. 505.

[4] But this appears to be deleted in the 'Errata' (vol. viii. pp. 391–2).

[5] *Baronage*, i. 536, 694.

against Hubert, one was that he had married a daughter of the king of Scots in spite of his previous wife, the countess of Gloucester, having been her kinswoman;[6] and another that he had never purchased, as he should have done, the *maritagium* of the countess of Gloucester from the crown.

Returning to Robert Fitzwalter himself, I find that Miss Norgate, who devotes a special appendix to 'Eustace de Vesci and Robert Fitz-Walter,'[7] speaks of 'the group of "Northerners," among whom the most conspicuous were two barons of secondary rank, Eustace de Vesci and Robert Fitz-Walter' (p. 219). Now this description is true enough of Eustace, a Yorkshire baron, who paid scutage on 24⅓ fees, but quite misleading as to Robert, who was certainly neither a Northerner nor 'of secondary rank.' Miss Norgate's own authority, the *Histoire des Ducs* (p. 145), classes 'Eustasses de Vesci' among the 'Norois,' but rightly places 'Robiers le fils Gautier' at the head of the other set of barons, who were not 'Norois.' So also Stubbs, classifying the barons of the Charter, names Eustace de Vesci at the head of 'the northern lords' and Robert Fitz-Walter at the head of the next class, 'the feudal and ministerial lords.'[8] As Miss Norgate states that he was lord 'by his marriage with an heiress of large estates in the north' (p. 290), her error must, I think, be derived from Professor Tout's article on Robert in the *Dictionary of National Biography*,[9] though she differs so sharply from his estimate of the baronial leader's character (pp. 289, 292).

As to the 'secondary rank' of Robert among English barons, her own authority, cited by herself, makes him '*uns des plus haus homes d'Engletierre et uns des plus poissans*,[10] a description borne out by the records. For his own fief scutage was paid on some sixty-six or sixty-seven fees,[11] while sixty fees were enough to constitute a barony of the first rank. But his wife, Gunnora de Valognes, brought him the whole of the Valognes estates, represent-

[6] 'De justitiario proposuit [archiepiscopus] quod habuit uxorem cujus consanguineam prius habuerat sibi matrimonio copulatam.' (R. Wendover, iii. 14; M. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* iii. 205.) Hubert's answer, by his agent Lawrence, was: 'De consanguinitate inter comitissam Gloverniae et filiam regis Scotiae nihil scit.' (M. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* vi. 71.) So too, according to the Dunstable Annals (*Ann. Mon.* iii. 28): 'Super divortio vero tertiae uxoris suae, scilicet filiae regis Scotiae, conventus, super eo quod erat consanguinea secundae uxoris suae, scilicet comitissae Gloverniae,' &c. They further state precisely that when she was widow of Geoffrey, earl of Essex, Hubert married her (*relictam ipsius duxit*) and that she '*post paucos dies decessit*.' (*Ibid.* p. 45.)

[7] *John Lackland*, pp. 289–293. [8] *Constitutional History* (1874), i. 540.

[9] It is there stated that her father's fief consisted of '30⅓ knight's fees, mainly situated in the north, so that his interests now became largely identical with the "Aquilonares," whom he afterwards led in the struggle against King John' (*Dict. of Nat. Biogr.* xix. 220.)

[10] *John Lackland*, p. 290.

[11] Pipe Roll 14 Hen. II. He also obtained some lands of his maternal uncle, Bishop Geoffrey, in 6 John.

ing over thirty-two fees.[12] Thus we may reckon his joint baronies at about 100 fees, while his special position in London as lord of Baynard's Castle added to his importance. Moreover, his wife's holdings and his own lay alike not in the north, but in the eastern counties, thus supporting his position in London.[13]

When we remember that the *caput* of the barony of his son-in-law, the earl of Essex, lay, like his own, in that county, and that Clare, the castle of the head of his house, his ally in the fight for the Charter, lay on the borders of Essex and Suffolk, it may fairly be suggested that the Eastern counties, and especially Essex, played a more prominent part in the struggle than has hitherto been recognised, and that their barons formed as distinct a group as the 'Northerners.' Among the most active opponents of the king were William de Lanvallei, an Essex baron, and Roger de Cressi, an East-Anglian one. Robert de Vere, earl of Oxford, a kinsman of the Mandevilles and the Clares, was an Essex magnate, whose stronghold in that county, Hedingham Castle, was taken by John and afterwards restored to him by Louis. Finally the house of Bigot, the East-Anglian earls, was also active against the king. Among the twenty-four barons (excluding the mayor of London) elected as guardians of the Charter, the above-named group was represented by the earl 'of Clare' and Gilbert de Clare, the earl of Norfolk and Hugh Bigod, the earls of Essex and of Oxford, Robert Fitzwalter himself, Richard de Muntfichet, another great Essex baron, whose castle was at Stanstead Muntfichet, his neighbour, John Fitz Robert, whose castle at Clavering gave name afterwards to his house, William de Lanvalay, of Colchester, and William de Huntingfeld of Huntingfield, Suffolk. Thus eleven, or all but half, were Eastern counties barons.[14] Is it, then, fanciful to suggest that when the advance guard of the French landed in the Orwell in November 1215, the reason for their selecting that landing-place was that it lay in the midst of Essex and Suffolk, where their friends were strongest?

The position of Robert Fitzwalter as an Eastern counties magnate is illustrated by a very curious episode ignored alike by Miss Norgate and by Professor Tout, although it appears to bear directly on his quarrel with John. In right of his wife Robert was patron of Binham Priory, a Valognes foundation in the extreme north of Norfolk, which brought him into conflict with St. Alban's Abbey, the mother house.[15] The trouble culminated in the abbot's removal of Thomas, prior of Binham, a great

[12] Pipe Roll 14 Hen. II.

[13] The Baynard fief, which Robert held, lay in the three eastern counties and in Hertfordshire in 1086, and so did that of Valognes.

[14] I do not count Geoffrey de Say, a cousin of the earl of Essex, because his interests lay elsewhere.

[15] The story of his conflict with St. Alban's is told in the *Gesta Abbatum*, i. 220–230, and, under Binham, in the *Monasticon*.

friend of Robert's, whereupon the priory was formally besieged by Robert, who insisted on the monks deposing the new prior from St. Alban's. On complaint being made to John of this violent action he swore '*per pedes Dei, ut moris habuit*,' that either he or Robert should be king of England. For, we read, they hated one another, and the king rejoiced at the chance of avenging himself on Robert. A friend of the latter was able to send him warning just in time for him to seek safety in flight before the arrival of the king's troops. This took place 'in the time of the Interdict.'

It may be useful, in conclusion, to correct a misapprehension as to Robert Fitzwalter's issue. Dugdale erroneously makes his son and successor Walter to be born of his marriage with Gunnora of Valognes.[16] Professor Tout writes that

> This Walter must have been either a younger son or a grandson. After the death of Gunnor (she was alive in 1207) it is said that Fitzwalter married a second wife, Rohese, who survived him.[17]

It is now known that Walter, Robert's successor, was his son by his second wife, and that Christina, his daughter by the Valognes heiress, inherited her mother's barony.[18] The *Histoire des Ducs* enables us to add a son and another daughter by Gunnora de Valognes, of whom the son was captured with his father at the battle of Lincoln, while they both died without issue, as did eventually Christina also.

J. H. Round.

The Tactics of the Battles of Boroughbridge and Morlaix.

In his important paper on the archers at Crecy in the *English Historical Review*, xii. 427–436, and also in his *Welsh Wars of Edward I*, Mr. J. E. Morris has thrown into clear relief the evolution of English tactics from Falkirk to Crecy. In his former article he 'appealed from Crecy to other battles' with very interesting results. But, as his chief object was to emphasise the gradual development of the employment of archery, he was naturally led to pay less attention to other aspects of the new tactics. I propose here to call attention to two links in the chain of development from Falkirk to Crecy which Mr. Morris has overlooked, doubtless as having in one case no great and in the other very little bearing on the particular point of archery. These two links are the battle of Boroughbridge of 1322 and the battle near Morlaix of 1342. The former of these shows English soldiers first applying against their own countrymen the Scottish system of fighting; the second seems to be the first occasion on which the

[16] *Baronage*, i. 220. [17] *Dictionary of National Biography*, xix. 222.
[18] See my article on 'Comyn and Valoignes' in the *Ancestor*, Oct. 1904.

tactics which later secured victory at Crecy were employed by Englishmen in a pitched battle on the continent. Neither of these fights has any place in Professor Oman's *History of the Art of War*.

There is no need to tell from the chroniclers the story of either of these battles. At Boroughbridge Earls Thomas of Lancaster and Humphrey of Hereford were retreating with their partisans from Edward II's forces in the direction of Scotland, when they were intercepted at the moment of their passage over the Ure by Sir Andrew Harclay and his border levies, well tried in the hard experience of warfare against Robert Bruce. On reaching the Ure Lancaster found the north bank of the stream, particularly the approaches to the bridge and the only neighbouring ford, strongly held by Harclay's men. The so called 'Chronicle of Lanercost' best gives the disposition of his forces.

> [Andreas de Harclay] praevenit comitem et praeoccupavit pontem de Burghbrigge, et *dimissis retro equis suis et suorum statuit in pedibus omnes milites et quosdam lancearios* ad borealem partem pontis, et contra vadum sive transitum aquae *posuit alios lancearios in scheltrum secundum modum Scotorum ad resistendum equitibus et equis in quibus adversarii confidebant.* Sagittariis autem praecepit ut venientibus inimicis spisse et continue sagittarent.[1]

Here we have (*a*) the dismounting of the knights and men-at-arms, (*b*) the conscious adaptation of the Scottish formation of the 'scheltrum' or square of pikemen, (*c*) the stress laid on the use of archers to ward off the enemies' attack, (*d*) the defensive tactics that these changes practically involved. Of course not all these things were complete novelties. I do not forget the knights who, as Professor Oman has shown us, fought on foot in earlier battles, as, for example, at Tenchebrai, at Bremûle, and at Lincoln (1141), but these earlier instances are outside the chain that binds Falkirk to Crecy. Limiting ourselves to this series, we cannot but see that Boroughbridge thus affords 'the earliest hint of the new English policy of dismounting,' and not the landing of the Disinherited on the coast of Fife just before Dupplin Moor, as Mr. Morris has taught us to believe. We must therefore qualify the suggestion of the canon of Bridlington, whom Mr. Morris quotes, to the effect that the dismounting policy before Dupplin was accidental, and was continued because found effective. We know from the Lanercost writer that it had been effective ten years earlier.

Harclay's disposition of his troops assured him an easy victory. It was in vain that the two earls set another precedent for the array of Dupplin, Halidon, and Crecy by deciding that Hereford and Clifford should dismount with their followers and proceed on foot to the attack on the bridge.

[1] *Chron. de Lanercost*, pp. 243–4 (Bannatyne Club).

Comites [sc. Lancaster and Hereford] . . . videntes dominum Andream praeoccupasse borialem partem pontis, ordinaverunt quod comes Herefordiae et dominus Rogerus de Clifforde . . . cum comitiva sua *praecederent in pedibus* et arriperent pontem supra lancearios.[2]

A glance taught Lancaster and Hereford, though neither was a great captain, what the French took years to learn—namely, that the dismounted pikemen could best be dealt with by opponents who accepted their method of fighting. It is curious, however, that Hereford with his Gwentian experience made no use of archers to clear away the defenders of the bridge, though the account of his failure and death shows that Harclay's archers had their part in his defeat.

Turning to Lancaster's attempt to cross the ford on horseback, we find that it was equally unsuccessful. As the Lanercost writer goes on—

Equites autem comitis qui voluerunt aquam transivisse, non potuerunt eam intrare prae multitudine et spissitudine telorum quae a sagittariis mittebantur in eos et in equos eorum.[3]

From these details we may infer that Boroughbridge rather than Dupplin Moor is the real starting-point of the English adoption of the new tactics that Mr. Morris has so well described. It is significant that the first English host to employ them should be Harclay's army of borderers, well tried in the conditions of Scottish warfare. Unluckily the Lanercost chronicler does not tell us where the archers of Harclay were posted. Assuming, if we may do so, that they were 'interlaced' with the foot, as in some of Edward I's Welsh battles, we may conclude that the chief improvement effected at Dupplin was the putting the archers in the wings.

The significance of the second battle, to which I wish to call attention, has been even more completely overlooked by modern writers, though there are fairly full recent accounts of it by Dr. Mackinnon[4] and M. Arthur de la Borderie.[5] The fight in question was fought by the earl of Northampton, near Morlaix, in Brittany, on 30 Sept. 1342. Northampton had been sent by Edward III to help the Montfortians, while the king prepared a larger expedition. After many successes in Leon and Cornouailles, both Montfortian regions, Northampton ventured to attack the stronghold of Charles of Blois, the vast county of Penthièvre, and besieged Morlaix, its south-western bulwark. Driven by Charles of Blois from the siege, he was forced to retreat further away from his base at Brest towards Lanmeur, on the road to Lannion.[6] Between Morlaix and Lanmeur he was forced to give battle. We seem in-

[2] *Chron. de Lanercost*, p. 243.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] *Hist. of Edward III*, pp. 233–4.
[5] *Hist. de Bretagne*, iii. 466–7.
[6] This direction of the retreat comes from an unedited charter, quoted *ibid.* iii. 467.

debted for our knowledge of this fight to English writers exclusively. Of these Murimuth[7] simply emphasises in two detached passages the importance of the English victory and the immense numerical superiority of the defeated side, Northampton having 500 men against Charles of Blois's 52,000 men-at-arms. But these random and ridiculous figures stand in conflict with a previous reference to what is plainly the same battle, in which Charles's numbers are 3,000 *armati* and 1,500 Genoese.[8] More valuable evidence comes from Knighton and Geoffrey le Baker. Of these Knighton[9] is by far the more precise as regards the disposition of the forces. After telling us that Charles of Blois *cum xx mille viris* had raised the siege of *quandam villam cum castro*—clearly of Morlaix—he goes on to describe the array:

> Et mane ceperunt [sc. Anglici] locum suum quasi per unam leucam ab inimicis prope unum boscum et foderunt foveas et fossas circa eos et cooperuerunt eas de feno et herbagio; et post solis ortum paraverunt se ad bellum.

Then Charles of Blois came on to attack in three 'battles,' of which the first included many *galleti*, which means, I suppose, Welshmen—that is, *Bretons bretonnants*. It may be assumed that these attacked on foot.[10] Anyhow they were immediately beaten, and then the other two French 'battles' came on. Knighton's words show that these were, as would naturally be the case, mounted men. He tells us how they

> ferocitate animi ducti opprimere Angliae gentes moliti sunt; et equorum suorum validorum pedibus conculcare volentes capitose irruerunt in eos, sed antris decepti obturatis, ut predictum est, ceciderunt quilibet super alium in foveis abinvicem confusi.

Thus the host of Charles of Blois was defeated after a hard fight. Knighton does not tell us clearly all that we should wish to know, but it seems almost certain from his account that the English fought on foot. Otherwise the pits, suggested by Bannockburn and anticipating what Baker tells us of Crecy, would be unintelligible. No sane general would have marshalled men-at-arms mounted on restless and high-spirited chargers just behind a row of pits. An involuntary movement forward would have caused the same disaster as befell the Bretons. Moreover by this time the English habit of fighting on foot was completely established. A more serious gap in the account is that we read nothing about the work of the archers. Yet, admitting the deficiencies of the evidence, we cannot but feel sure that Northampton in this obscure fight between Morlaix and Lanmeur substantially anticipated the

[7] Pp. 127, 128–9, Rolls Series. [8] *Ibid.* p. 127. [9] *Chron.* ii. 25, Rolls Series.

[10] M. de la Borderie is quite sure of this: 'La première [bataille] . . . composée de ces troupes irrégulières à pied qu'on appelait *ribauds* ou *galois*' (*Hist. de Bretagne*, iii. 467).

array of Crecy. We have most of the essential points—the defensive action, the flanking woods, the dismounted men-at-arms, the concealed pits, the great odds, the preliminary and futile attack of the enemy's foot, the rush of the heavy cavalry charge, and, after hard fighting, the decisive result. Even trivial analogies—the attack delayed till late in the day,[11] and the inability of the scanty force of victors to do more than withdraw safely, complete the closeness of the anticipation of Crecy. And we must not forget that Northampton was in high command at Crecy, being one of the two leaders of the left 'battle' that flanked the array of the Black Prince. Consideration of these facts and inferences makes us realise that the historical comments of Geoffrey le Baker [12] on the battle are something more than mere rhetoric.

Pugnatum est fortiter ex utraque parte, ita quod contigit illo certamine quod nec in bellis, nec de Halydonehiel nec de Cressi nec de Petters, audivimus contigisse.

The shrewdest judgment of the battle of Morlaix is that which thus makes it a link in the chain between Halidon Hill and Crecy and Poitiers.

T. F. Tout.

Tithing Lists from Essex, 1329–1343.

Manorial court-rolls contain constant references to various details of the tithing-system. Very frequently, the record of a leet-court is headed by a list of the headmen (*capitales plegii*), by whose presentments, in answer to the 'Articles' propounded by the steward, the jurisdiction of the court was exercised. Less frequent are complete lists, showing the manner in which the tithing-men (*decenarii*) were grouped under these headmen. The following lists are found in the court-rolls of Chatham-Hall, one of the seven manors in the extensive parish of Great Waltham, Essex. In this, as in many other Essex manors, every member of the tithing had yearly to pay to the lord of the manor 1*d.* to make up the 'common fine' on the leet-day, and in these lists the sum for each tithing is noted. The tithings are six in number, each under the joint control of two headmen. The first list comes at the head of the court-leet roll for Tuesday in Easter week, 27 March, 1329:

Chatham.—*Visus franci plegii tenti ibidem die Martis in Septimana Paschae anno regni regis Edwardi tertii post conquestum tertio.*

Cap. pleg. { Robertus Levelif / Johannes Startleg } habent in eorum decena:—

xv*d.*

[11] 'Circa horam nonam' (Murimuth, p. 127), i.e. from 2 to 4 P.M., which would not leave many hours of light on 30 Sept.

[12] P. 76, ed. E. Maunde Thompson.

Radulfum Hegnon, Johannem Levelif, Johannem Cok, Robertum Trippe, Henricum Rat, Ricardum Rat, Ricardum Heghnon, Galfridum Heghnon, Willelmum Levelif, Johannem Levelif juniorem, Adam Levelif, Robertum filium Johannis Levelif, Rogerum Levelif.

Cap. pleg. viii*d.* { Andreas Hegnon / Saherus Mot } habent in eorum decena :—
Nicholaum Samar, Willelmum Clobbe, Willelmum Edward, Andream Samar daȳe, Willelmum Mot, Willelmum Heghnon.

Cap. pleg. vii*d.* { Thomas Randolf / Johannes le long } habent in eorum decena :—
Johannem Saward, Petrum Litele, Ricardum Whitbred, Walterum Reynold, Ranulphum Spileman.

Cap. pleg. x*d.* { Andreas Samar / Johannes Spileman } habent in eorum decena :—
Johannem Trippe, Ricardum ate Broke, Johannem Prentys, Robertum Prentis, Johannem ate Brok, Willelmum Whitbred, Johannem ate hundred, Johannem Samar.

Cap. pleg. xi*d.* { Johannes le little / Andreas Aylwyne } habent in eorum decena :—
Johannem le long, Johannem Adam webbe, Saherum le webbe, Johannem Adam brodheued, Johannem filium Johannis little, Johannem Frebarn webbe, Johannem Ailwyne, Johannem filium Johannis Little seniorem, Willelmum le Little.

Cap. pleg. ix*d.* { Johannes ate Brok / Johannes cocus } habent in eorum decena :—
Saherum Startleheg, Johannem Startleheg, Johannem Clobbe, Robertum cocum, Ricardum Samar, Johannem Heuekyn, Johannem ate Wode.

It will be seen that this list gives sixty persons on the tithings, and therefore a common fine of 5*s*. It may be noted, from the information elsewhere supplied by the rolls, that the majority of these people were born serfs. *Nativus domini* is constantly attached to the surnames Adam, Aylwyne, ate Brok, Clobbe, Cok, Edward, Heghnon, ate Hundred, Randolf, Rat, Samar, Saward, Startleheg, Trippe, Whitbred, ate Wode. The only person on the list who is definitely stated to have been a freeman is John Prentys. In 1332 the list was brought to date by striking out Radulfus Heghnon (tithing I), Nicholaus Samar (II), Johannes filius Johannis Little senior (V), and Johannes Heuekyn (VI), in each case as 'mortuus,' and by adding Johannes Sleuir at the end

of tithing III. This gave a list of fifty-seven, and a common fine of 4*s.* 9*d.*

A second list is found at the end of the roll for the court-leet of 22 April, 1337 :

Cap. pleg. { Walterus Saundre / Johannes Stratleheg } et eorum decenarii :—
xiii*d.*
Willelmus Levelif ('remotus[1] quod fecit finem'), Adam Levelif, Johannes Levelif midling, Johannes Levelif junior, Johannes Stratleheg junior, Johannes Cok, Robertus Trippe, Henricus Rat, Ricardus Rat, Ricardus Hegnon, Galfridus Hegnon, Rogerus Levelif.

Cap. pleg. { Andreas Hegnon / Johannes Clement } et eorum decenarii :—
ix*d.*
Willelmus Motte, Willelmus Hegnon, Ricardus le White, Johannes Pourte, Sayerus Motte, Simon le Long, Petrus Hegnon.

Cap. pleg. { Johannes Denhale / Robertus Randolf } et eorum decenarii :—
vii*d.*
Johannes Saward, Petrus le Littele, Ricardus Whitbred, Ranulfus Spileman, Johannes Sliver.

Cap. pleg. { Andreas Samar / Johannes Spileman } et eorum decenarii :—
viii*d.*
Ricardus atte Brok, Johannes atte Brok junior, Johannes atte Hundrede, Johannes Samar, Willelmus Samare, Andreas Samar senior.

Cap. pleg. { Johannes Littele / Andreas Aylwyne } et eorum decenarii :—
x*d.*
Johannes Adam webbe, Johannes Adam brodheuid, Johannes Littele minor, Johannes Frebaren, Sayerus Frebarin, Johannes Aylwene, Willelmus Littele, Nicholaus Somer.

Cap. pleg. { Robertus cocus / Johannes atte Broke } et eorum decenarii :—
x*d.*
Sayerus Strateleheg, Johannes Strateleheg, Ricardus Samar, Johannes ate Wode, Willelmus cocus, Johannes Clobbe, Willelmus Clobbe, Ricardus Marionn.

This, again, gives us a list of fifty-seven, and the common fine of 4*s.* 9*d.* This second list has been much pulled about, (*a*) by striking out names (nine of them because 'mortuus,' others as

[1] It will be noticed that his name has to be left out in estimating the xiii*d.* paid by this tithing to the common fine.

having purchased exemption 'per finem' and some as having become 'cap. pleg.'), (*b*) making additions, and (*c*) altering the marginal sums. This was in 1343. In the list in tithing II, we have Willelmus Motte scored out and noted 'remotus per finem.' In the court-leet, 2 April, 1342, William Mot paid 18*d.* *ut removeatur ab officio decenarii*. Making alterations as directed, we have the following list for 1343:

Cap. pleg. { Walterus Saundre / Johannes Stratleheg } et eorum decenarii :— xiii*d.*

Adam Levelif, Johannes Stratleheg junior, Johannes Cok, Robertus Trippe, Ricardus Rat, Ricardus Hegnon, Galfridus Hegnon, Rogerus Levelif, Robertus Leuelif, Andreas Startleheg, Johannes Reynolds.

Cap. pleg. { Andreas Hegnon / Johannes Prentys } et eorum decenarii :— x*d.*

Willelmus Hegnon, Ricardus le White, Johannes Pourte, Sayerus Motte, Simon le Long, Johannes Rat, Andreas Lyttle, Johannes le White filius Ricardi le White.

Cap. pleg. { Edmundus Prat / Ricardus Maryonn } et eorum decenarii :— viii*d.*

Petrus le Littele, Ranulfus Spileman, Johannes Sliver, Robertus le chapman, Johannes Feraunt, Thomas Randolf.

Cap. pleg. { Andreas Samar / Johannes Spileman } et eorum decenarii :— ix*d.*

Ricardus atte Brok, Johannes atte Brok junior, Johannes atte Hundrede, Johannes Samar, Willelmus Samar, Rogerus Samar, Johannes filius Johannis at Hundrede.

Cap. pleg. { Johannes Littele / Andreas Aylwyne } et eorum decenarii :— viii*d.*

Johannes Adam webbe, Johannes Littele minor, Johannes Frebaren, Johannes Aylwene, Willelmus Littele, Nicholaus Somer.

Cap. pleg. { Robertus cocus / Willelmus le Longe } et eorum decenarii :— viii*d.*

Ricardus Samar, Willelmus cocus, Johannes Clobbe, Willelmus Clobbe, Johannes Trippe, Johannes Sleuyr filius Johannis Sleuyr.

We have thus, for 1343, fifty-six names, representing a common fine of 4*s.* 8*d.*

It may be of interest to give, from the court-leet of the years

next to these lists, an exact instance of each step in the tithing-system, attached to a name occurring in the lists.

(*a*) When a resident labourer's son passed his twelfth year, the court-leet ordered him to be placed in a tithing. 21 April, 1332: *Omnes capitales plegii presentant quod Willelmus cocus est plenae aetatis ad ponendum in decenam. Item presentant quod Johannes Startleheg est de eodem statu.* Accordingly, in 1337, we find these two in tithing VI.

(*b*) When an incoming labourer had resided for a year in the manor, he was ordered to go on a tithing, and the order enforced by fines on himself or on his employer. 24 May, 1328, *presentant quod Johannes Slyver est extra decenam; ideo in misericordia iii d.; et receptatur cum Andrea Aylwyne.* 2 April, 1331: *Omnes capitales plegii presentant quod Johannes Slyver est extra decenam: ideo preceptum est attachiare. Postea venit et misit se in decenam.* In the 1332 revision we find him in tithing III.

(*c*) A tithing-man had to attend every court-leet, and his two headmen were often held responsible for his appearance. 27 March, 1329, *misericordia iii d.: presentant quod Johannes Trippe decenarius facit defaltam: ideo in misericordia.* 2 April, 1336, *dicunt quod Henricus le Rat est decenarius et non venit: ideo* [*ipse in misericordia*]. *Item dicunt quod Willelmus Levelyf est decenarius, et non venit: ideo etc. Misericordia vi d. de Waltero Sandre et Johanne Startleheg, capitalibus plegiis, quod non habuerunt Willelmum Levelyf. Misericordia vi d. de eisdem quod non habuerunt Henricum le Rat: in misericordia.* The 1337 list shows that these were in tithing I.

ANDREW CLARK.

Correspondence of Archbishop Herring and Lord Hardwicke during the Rebellion of 1745.

PART II.

XV.

The Archbishop of York to Lord Hardwicke.

October 6 1745.

My Lord,—I have the honour of your Lordships of the 3rd inst. Nothing new has occurred here lately—We are at present in a state of great repose, partly supported by the spirit which is shining at London and in the southern part of the Island, and partly from assurances given us, that Berwick and Newcastle are in no present danger from the Rebels. Our last advices are that they are divided into three bodies, the large one of 4 or 5000 in Edinburgh and the camp, 2000 returned to the North to gather their oats, and 1000 marching towards England. Oglethorpe tells me today, this is their present situation. The Castle seems to be in

danger, but I hope Guest will hold out till relief comes, at the worst. Their attention to that business, and the secession for the harvest time, will give the King time, what is more wanted at present, to collect and march his army. Oglethorpe is very alert, wants to collect our Lord Lieutenants and their forces together, and in conjunction with the Cleveland men to make the mien of opposition—at least to try to make these rascals suspend their incursions. I see from Lord Somervilles own hand that his house has been plundered, and three of his servants killed upon the spot, but two of the Highlanders were killed afterwards, which he feared would occasion setting fire to his house. Oglethorpe tells me, that the Scotch nobility in the Kings interest have offered, if empowered to do it, to regain the kingdom; it had been easier perhaps to have prevented the loss of it. I never had an opinion of Scotch faith, and now I am sure I never shall.

I purposed to have set out for London on Wednesday next, but I have had a sort of remonstrance from the City here, that it will create some uneasiness. There is a great matter in opinion, and if my presence at Bishopthorpe seems to support a spirit or preserve an Union, or that the people think so, I will not stir. For nothing is so hurtful at these times of suspicion, as a panic, which perhaps, as it is easily occasioned, is as easily prevented. I am sure it is so. If my presence will prevent it I have therefore put off my journey, but ordered my affairs so, that at the least intimation from your Lordship I can *vasa conclamare*, and set out in an hour. To talk in the style military (though my red coat is not made yet) the first column of my family went off a week ago, the second moves on Wednesday, and the third attends my motion. I purpose to leave my house in a condition to receive the Marshal if he pleases to make use of it, and there is a sort of policy in my civility too, for, while he occupies it, it cannot be plundered. I know your Lordship has even an anxiety for your friends, but, if I must fly, the General and his hussars have offered to cover my retreat. But enough of this—I had rather laugh when the battle is won, and could not help putting up an ejaculation at the Pond side tonight—God grant I may feed my swans in peace! Your Lordship will be so good as to excuse my attendance at the opening of Parliament to my Royal Master if he condescends to enquire after me.

I am, my Lord, with perfect truth,

Your Lordship's most obliged and faithful friend,

THO: EBOR:

Fairfax and Tempest's houses have been searched, but no appearance of mischief.

XVI.

The Same to the Same.

Oct 9 1745.

My Lord,—I am honoured with your Lordships of the 5th inst, and am very glad my intention of staying here falls in with your judgment, and the rest of my friends in London. I do it with pleasure, and have presumed upon Mr Pelhams leave to keep one of his friends here as my assistant—Fred. Frankland, who however is ready to obey a call.

Our subscriptions here, I believe, will amount to more than 40000*l*., and the forces, York and Hull included, to 4000 horse and foot. I had spoke to the Postmaster here about the Caledonian Mercury, and he had reason to suppose that one came last Post, but dare not open it, though I sent word I would justify him. He is an honest man, and would readily submit to proper Powers, and therefore if it is judged right to enable me, at this juncture, to open any letters, I will see it executed while I stay. A fellow in York, D[r] Drake a Surgeon,[1] who was long suspected to be a Jacobite, has declared himself so by refusing publicly to take the oaths. It is a good discovery, for his insinuations here have done much mischief. My secretary is going to York, to watch the Northern Mail, and if anything material comes, to communicate it to your Lordship.

I am with most affectionate Esteem, my Lord,
Your Lordships ever obliged and faithful friend,
THO: EBOR:

XVII.

Lord Hardwicke to the Archbishop of York.

Powis House, Oct[r] 12 1745.

My Lord,—I have now two letters of yours unacknowledged, for which I return your Grace my sincere thanks. The continuance of that fine spirit, which has shone forth with so much lustre in your part of the North, rejoices me, as well as the success which has hitherto attended your meritorious labours. In the south it has been greatly propagated, and the raising of regiments does in several parts go on, though I cannot say that the Association of Subscription in the City of London has made all the progress that one could wish. The meeting in Surrey was a prodigious one, and showed great zeal and alacrity. As to General Oglethorpe's intelligence, that the Scotch nobility had offered, if empowered, to regain the kingdom, I cannot say that I have heard of any such offer. Some few Lords indeed have talked of raising men in Scotland, in case the rebels leave it, and march into England, but I fear that will be a work of time, especially after all that has happened. I think your Grace has determined quite right in staying for the present at Bishop-Thorpe, and everybody here thinks so too. As soon as M[r] Pelham returns from Sussex, whither he went on Thursday to a general meeting, I will acquaint him with the reason of M[r] Frankland's staying with you. I find your Grace has learned the Style Military, and presume, though the paragraph about your Grace's red coat was not true, yet you are by this time skilled in the exercise, and can use the word of command. It brings to ones mind Shakespeare's Henry IV[th]:—'My gentle Lord of York . . . assembles all his Powers,'—though it happened that predecessor of yours mistook his side.

I am glad Edinburgh Castle, partly by threats, and partly by a little execution, has found means to relieve itself, and get in some provisions. I never thought that would be complied with till the last extremity. Possibly it is their despair of starving out the Castle makes them think of

[1] Francis Drake, author of *Eboracum*. He was compelled to enter into recognisances, and lost his post as city surgeon.

marching southward, and we have intelligence here that they intended to begin their march as upon Tuesday or Wednesday last; but we have heard nothing further. It is surprising that there should still be such an uncertainty about their numbers. Lockhart of Carnwath is come to Berwick, and has put himself into the power of the King's officers. This looks like a good symptom, and yet he, whose disposition and conduct is well known, has no great opinion of their success.

I am sorry your Postmaster is so nice. In such times as these people must take something upon themselves. I will speak about proper orders being sent to him.

I am ever, with the truest esteem, my dear Lord, most faithfully yours,

HARDWICKE.

XVIII.

The Archbishop of York to Lord Hardwicke.

Bishop Thorpe, Oct^{r} 19 1745.

My Lord,—It is not possible for me to forbear sending to your Lordship everything that occurs to me of moment at this nice and perilous season. The companies that were raised here by the Gentlemen have been completed some time, and they have been in daily expectation of arms for them, which they say they had assurance from above were put on shipboard for Hull, but afterwards, for reasons of despatch and safety, removed into waggons, above three weeks ago. They have heard nothing at all of them since, nor have any sort of information where they are. You cannot imagine, my Lord, what an effect this disappointment has upon the whole Country; I see and hear a world of people every day, and I will tell your Lordship, as becomes an honest man and the Kings faithful subject, what they say upon the occasion. Before they speak, they lift up their eyes and shrug their shoulders;—'What, no news of Arms yet? Have we deserved this neglect? Are the Ministers asleep? Or do they mean to despite all we can do to defend ourselves, and tell the world so? Or do they intend to expose us to the derision of our enemies, and, after an expense of some thousand pounds, to gather together and clothe our people, will they put us into the poor condition of the well-affected class in Scotland, without arms, at the mercy of these ruffians?' I do assure your Lordship this is the plain literal truth and matter of fact, and I do in my conscience think, if this affair is not *instantly* attended to and satisfaction given to people's minds, this uneasiness will grow up into a rank and strong indignation. I pray God send us good news to day from Scotland, for if the rebels are in motion Southward, I can't describe the terror it would occasion—I am sure of it; the noble spirit of defence which has appeared here will, from this single circumstance of want of arms, sink into despondency and lame submission, if it produces nothing worse. Wade intended to move northwards tomorrow or Monday, but if he was here in Quarters at York, with all his army, the gentlemen of this country are disposed to the highest resentment, if the men whom they have raised have not at least the credit of arms in their hands. Your Lordship cannot imagine how shamed and vexed the King's friends are, that their men are forced to exercise with broomstaffs.

In good truth, this is a most serious matter, and well known to the rebels, who, by means of an open and uncontrolled post, have to my knowledge a regular correspondence with people in the City of York. I hear extreme bad news from the Camp at Doncaster—quarrels, mutinies, and almost a murder, but the temper and prudence of the Magistrate has composed them for the present.

I received another paper from Edinburgh by the last post, which I transmit to day to your Lordship, but I presume they are scattered all over the Kingdom.

Upon reviewing my letter, I doubt I have run into a sort of saucy freedom, but if your Lordship thinks it of moment to be shown to the D. of N. I am sure you will answer for me, that it comes from an honest principle, and from an anxiety that nothing should be done or omitted, that can tend to the hurt or embarrassment of the King's affairs, or the discredit of his faithful servants.

I am, my Lord, your Lordships ever most affectionately,

THO : EBOR :

Extract.

Bishopthorpe, Oct^{r} 28 1745.

— I am frighted with stress of bloody frays every day between the Dutch and English. It seems our fellows are perpetually twitting them with their poltroonery at Fontenoy. Would to God we were rid of them, and in due time with all connection with their perfidious masters! They quarrelled on Monday night at Ferrybridge. Good my Lord, dont forget the affair of arms for our Yorkshiremen. I feel I press that matter unhandsomely, but if it be not immediately taken care of, every thing that has been done here will be in a manner undone. I know this to be true from certain intelligence from every Riding.

XIX.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Oct^{r} 28 1745.

My Lord,—It was with great pain to me that I troubled your Lordship so upon the subject of arms, and I was fully sensible how cruel it would be to teaze the Ministers at this unfortunate juncture, but I thought it a point of duty to the public, and agreeable to that friendship with which I desire to be for ever attached to your Lordship, to apprize you fully of a thing of that consequence. I had yesterday the honour of your Lordships, and soon after an express came to Lord Irwin, who has been with me these two days, that a competent number of arms was or would soon be ready at Hull. Due notice shall be given of this instantly, and I dare say, the spirit of the country will continue such as it was a month ago.

I send the enclosed to your Lordship. The memorial may possibly be new to you; I think it is good. It is remarked at the bottom of one edition of this paper that it was published at the time the contribution was raised in Glasgow. It is added too that 900 Highlanders had deserted. I had a Kirk Minister with me the other day, who was a Volunteer at Edinburgh at the surrender of the town. He was a man of sense and

apparent credit, and gave a confident account of things. It is beyond doubt that the City was betrayed, and that the Lord Provost did of most deliberate perfidy give up the guns upon the Walls, and the arms lent out of the Castle for the defence of the City. I except the arms of the Volunteers, which were put into the Castle again. . . . My secretary is just gone to York to attend the northern mail, and has my orders, if anything material arrives, to send it to your Lordship. General Wade does very prudently in concealing any disagreeable circumstances with regard to our joint forces, and is the best man in the world to prevent mischief. He has done it hitherto. The army marched in good spirits, and the better for receiving £9000 from Leeds of the public money. It has been well received. It halted yesterday at Northallerton, proceeds to day onwards to Newcastle, which the Marshal purposes to reach on Tuesday. I hear Lord Malton received instructions from Wade at Doncaster how to make the best use of our country forces, which I hope he will put in motion. The mischief that ugly affair does is incredible. It has put an absolute stop to trade and business, and if it holds a little longer, I I believe I must go upon credit for my bread and cheese. But that want of business in the W. Riding has made it much easier to raise soldiers there, for the manufacturer[2] has no other way to get bread. I hope some folks will consider the Chevalier's declaration very maturely, and ask themselves, whence he has received some of his principal topics of encouragement. I am sorry to hear that a spirit of *previously* redressing what are called grievances is stirring in a Certain Place. As to that, I think a single question would be worth a years debate. 'Sir, my house is in flames. Shall I try to put out the fire, or first satisfy myself by whose neglect or wickedness the mischief happened?'

My best compliments wait upon Lady Hardwick and your young soldier. I am sure he would not be frightened with a Highland broadsword as poor Lascelles was. God forbid, though, he should come in the reach of one. I accept the appellation of Camerade from him with all my heart. I find I must get into regimentals in my own defence in a double sense: for an engraver has already given me a Saracen's head surrounded with the Chevalier in chains and all the instruments of war, and the hydra of rebellion at my feet, and I see another copper-plate is promised where I am to be exhibited in the same martial manner with all my clergy with me. By my troth, as I judge from applications made to me every day, I believe I could raise a regiment of my own order, and I had a serious offer the other day from a Welsh curate at the bottom of Merionethshire,[3] who is six feet and a half high, that, hearing I had put on scarlet, he was ready to attend me at an hour's warning, if the Bishop of Bangor did not call upon him for the same service.

I should mention to your Lordship that the Scotch Kirk Minister named above expressed himself extremely solicitous that the Government should not lay the imputation of disloyalty on the Scotch nation at Geneva.

I am, my Lord, your Lordship's faithful Servant,

THOS: EBOR.

[2] Clearly equivalent to *operative*, a sense of the word now entirely disused.
[3] Merionethshire was in Archbishop Herring's former diocese of Bangor.

XX.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Nov^{r} 3 1745.

My Lord,—I now sit down to communicate some things possibly worth your Lordship's observation, which I have just taken from the mouth of a Scotch Refugee, as they call themselves, who dined with me, and is just come out of Aberdeenshire, and a man of figure in his country. He appears thoroughly well affected to the King. He made a shift by steering westward to get into England, clear of the Rebels, and passed through Newcastle to talk with Wade and make his observations there, after having informed himself pretty well of the circumstances of the rebel army. To begin with what he says of their condition, and, as is natural, what he has heard of the character and qualities of the leader. He is told, that he is of undoubted courage and resolution, and determined to conquer or die, as he has publicly professed. His presence is good, and he affects a very winning affability, conversing almost with the lowest now and then. He is said too to have a good understanding, and my author thinks himself pretty well informed, that most of the things that have been well done in the progress of his affairs, have been done by his advice, and he was with great difficulty restrained from charging at the head of his men at the battle of Preston Pans. I enquired into what is said of the truth of his attachment to his religion, and was assured that he and all his people have purposely avoided showing anything like it. That he never has Mass said, has not a priest about him, and declined any communication with the Episcopal divines. As to his army, he confirms the notion of their being 8000; that they have the best intelligence, that they certainly will not disperse for reasons of fear. That they will act *pro re natâ*, and not come into England unless it should appear the eligible scheme, and that, if they do slip Wade, they will march like a torrent. He speaks of it as a certainty, that their chiefs extremely regret their not pursuing their advantage at Haddington, which does indeed look like an infatuation in them. They boast that half Wade's army, and particularly the D[utch], will either be passive or act with them and endeavour to persuade their people, that many of the English gentlemen who are associated will in due time pull off the mask and declare for them; it being, they say, the only method left for their friends to arm in their favour.

Thus much for the rebel forces; my friend halted at Newcastle, and made his observations there; and the reports he brings are disagreeable, but I must and will relate them to your Lordship. He says that the numbers, he is told, are far short of report; that there are great deficiences in the corps, and besides that very many of them are sick. That as to those that are well, there are great doubts of their integrity. That the Scotch and Irish are suspected to be false, and the first not disposed to fight against their countrymen. That most of the D[utch] are Papists, and that, if there are not many priests armed among them, that they are there in disguise. He says that one of St George's dragoons was discharged at Durham for declaring over night in his cups, and standing to it the next morning when he was sober,—That Right was with the Pre-

tender and his son,—and there certainly have been such facts in Sinclair's and other regiments.

These things he said he mentioned in private, and as reasons of caution, and so far they are good, for, great as our army is, Prudence to be sure would suggest that we should not contemn our enemy, but consider some resource in case of a disappointment. My guest went on in the following manner. If I may speak the sentiments of an honest man:—Our Governors, as they paid too little attention to the King's friends at the beginning, seem to continue in the same bad politics still. The true friends of K G are nine parts in ten of Scotland, but without authority, arms, or money. The Lord Loudoun and the president are in the north, but for want of the materials above mentioned can do nothing. Lord Loudoun has carried £4000 and some arms, but very insufficient. Soon after the beginning of this affair, the Grants alone assembled in the number of a thousand good men, but could not stir nor act for want of power, but yet their assembling only defeated the rebel levies for ten miles round them; They are still in the same disposition, and so are the men of Argyllshire, and many in the West, and nothing can import the Government more than to collect and arm a competent number of these men, who might be of incredible service to the King's affairs, by cutting off the retreat of the rebels, and their communication with the northern ports, which are now all open; or, in any case of any disaster to the King's army, affording a resource or reinforcement. He says the rebels give out great expectations from the Western Isles, but none have yet come in, and he hopes will not. He mentioned one thing, which may be deemed of little consequence at London, but he thinks very material, That care should be taken to circulate good intelligence in the northern parts of Scotland, which would be well read, and obviate the mischief arising from delusive lies of the rebels.

I have now told your Lordship my facts and my reasonings. Sir Archibald Grant is my author, and he gives me leave to name him. Your Lordship I dare say knows him; I do not. Perhaps the Ch[aritable] Corporation affair has not helped his reputation, but he is a man of sense, and the Grants he says have been Whigs at origin, but, in their cases, one would hear a fool, and receive information, if one could from an Enemy. Sir Archibald says that the people publicly about the Pretender are weak ones, but that there are abler hands behind the Curtain, who draw up all their public things. . . .

I am ever your Lordships most faithfully,

THO: EBOR.

I was going to fold up my letter, but your Lordship will pardon me for two or three stories of chit chat. As to what I have said of this Young Pretenders affability, I have reason to retract it, being assured that his behaviour is rather stiff. I would observe that Sir Archibald s account of the temper of the rebel army as to courage was speaking of them three weeks ago. There is one thing worth observing, that the spirit of enthusiasm is very strong in the army, and that there is amongst them a sober turn of religion, an instance of which he knows in the behaviour of two Highlanders, who were treated by D[r] Wisheart's lady.

She said the fellows covered their faces with their bonnets, and said grace, observing to her that they kept up that good old custom, though the fashionable folks had dropped it. They professed themselves protestants, and determined friends to Hereditary Right. I must give your Lordship a mark of this young mans religion. Upon being called to attend his father to mass, he refused with an oath to go, for it has cost his father three kingdoms. For his courage, it seems Schulemberg said of him, that he should be loath to have a crown which that man had a right to. I find two stories current in Edinburgh to the disadvantage of a great D[uke], one, that he gave it as a reason for his inaction in Scotland, that he did not choose to have two halters about his neck at once, from the severity of the disarming Act, and the progress of the Chevalier. The other intimates the opinion people have of him, for in a conversation, where some Highlanders were jocosely parcelling out his estate, a sly Highlander asked the gentleman whether the Dukes neutrality had no merit in it.

M[r] M[c]Laurin, who converses with many young gentlemen that have travelled, seems to think it likely that this young [man] is in the scheme of no religion at all, but of the loose Deistical turn prevalent at present.

* The Young Pretenders character is now well known. He had no great personal courage, but obstinacy enough. He certainly professed to have his religion to choose, and has said to Humphries the painter, that his family had suffered too much from priests for him to have anything to do with them. He grew sottish, indolent &c after his escape from Scotland, is said to have been in London a few years after the rebellion, and the late King being told of it, forbid any notice to be taken of him.

XXI.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Nov[r] 6 1745.

My Lord,—I am afraid your Lordship will think that my letters smell strong of the gloomy North and the despairing month of November, but, if I am of any use here, it is by communicating to your Lordship what I hear of any moment, and leave it to your consideration. The perusal of the Gazette this morning of the 2[nd] inst. has put me upon troubling your Lordship now. I find there several encouraging circumstances to the Kings friends mentioned, as received from Berwick, relating to Lord Lowdon and Col. Campbell, which I doubt have no truth in them. and your Lordship will please to hear the reason of my doubt. M[r] M[c]Laurin, who left me this morning for the North, showed me a letter yesterday from M[r] Pringle, a refugee now at Durham. It is dated Nov[r] 2[nd] and cautions M[r] M[c]Laurin from believing any thing of the reports from the North mentioned in that day's Newcastle Courant. Now those reports are of the same favourable sort expressly with those in the Gazette. He adds that a messenger is returned from Edinburgh despatched by Baron Craigie and Lord Arnistown, who reports the pre-

* The following paragraph is manifestly a much later addition by another hand. Ed. *E.H.R.*

sent number of rebels at about 7000. It is asserted on all hands that 5000 of these are as fine fellows as any in Europe. I have great confidence in General Wade, but I own I think we take it too much for granted, that he can't possibly miscarry, and I wish our credulity in one respect now mayn't hurt us as much as our incredulity did some time ago in another. I fancy if I was with your Lordship now, you would send me up to a Lady whom you are pleased to call Cassandra. I own frankly our present situation does call to my mind instances in which great wicked nations have been severely scourged by very despicable instruments. The proceedings at Westminster do not tend to clear me of these apprehensions. I am so chagrined at the unreasonableness of some late motions, that I think the Patrons of the Divisions would have hurt the public less if they had subscribed to a regiment or two for the services of ——.

I am ever, My Lord, your Lordship's most faithfully & affectionately,

THO: EBOR:

XXII.

The Same to the Same.

Novr 10th 1745.

My Lord,—Whatever be the issue of this doubtful state of things, and however it may please God to deal with this distracted nation, the present Ministers, who have the confidence of His Majesty, and the conduct of public affairs, will be sure to have the approbation of all good men for their integrity and very singular patience, which certainly has been tried to the utmost. The great consolation I received at this fearful juncture arose from the prospect of our hearty unanimity, which certainly, if kept up to its first appearance, would have done its work without bloodshed. But that prospect is over, and long before this our enemies are convinced from London, that there are still people enow, that are either so weak or so designing as to help their cause much better than their faithful ally from France can do; for I do assure you such is the judgment of all good people here upon the late Divisions at W[estminster]. Nobody would much have wondered to have seen such behaviour in Jacobites, but that any man of sense of a better denomination should join such malcontents is beyond our comprehension here, more especially when we are told that the dependants of a certain very great man have lent an helping hand to ruin their Masters family. For my part, I can give but one reason for the conduct of some Whigs on this occasion, but that they really think that the danger is all over, and that they have nothing to do but debate *en gayeté de cœur*. It were well if those gentlemen would consider, that before we set about improving our constitution, they should be quite sure that we have any Constitution at all. I shall long to hear the result of the conference of the two Houses; for if a man is found, that can scruple to lend an helping hand to repress the insolence of the enemy in their public declarations, he should be furnished with accoutrements and *transire in castra hostium*.

I send your Lordship the enclosed, not from any new intelligence in it, but for the certainty of what is there. The writer is a very good

honest young clergyman, chaplain to the Royal Hunters, and his account is more consistent than any I have seen. The postmaster at Dumfries told me by Wednesday's post he feared he should be able to write no more, and by his silence on Friday I judge the rebels were at that town, and are now moving westward. For God's sake, my Lord, obviate as much as possible the notion that the enemy is contemptible, and Wade invincible; neither is true, the enemy is certainly extremely formidable. The enclosed, of which M^r^ Yorke has a copy, is a proof of their spirit, and what shall we say, if they have advocates in S^t^ Stephen's chapel?

We are extremely at a loss here to account for our hearing nothing of the President and Lord Lowdon. It is to me the more surprising, as every Scotchman I have seen, and I have seen and do see many, assures me that the K's friends there are at least six to one, and ready to unite at an hour's warning.

The enclosed appeal is a mark of the lion, before he is in power. It raised my indignation, and on Saturday I set myself to transpose it, and I submit it to your Lordship's judgment whether it is right it should be answered, and if it be, whether I have hit upon the proper method of doing it. If your Lordship approve of it, I have desired my friend M^r^ Say of Ely House to attend your summons. His brother is a printer, and I can safely trust M^r^ Say with the whole management. Your Lordship will please to inform me, that it came safe to hand. If I had more time it should not have come in so slovenly a manner. If Say has the answer, your Lordship may safely trust him with the printed papers.

I am ever, My Lord, most faithfully,

THO: EBOR:

XXIII.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Nov^r^ 13^th^ 1745.

My Lord,—I am extremely obliged to your Lordship for yours of the 9^th^ inst.[4] on many accounts. It has given me a clear and right notion of my Scotch Bart. and a good key to his intelligence and his reasonings. I have received a letter from him since on his road to Sir James Grants, in Town, where he now is, but that contains so romantic a scheme of public defence at this juncture, that I begin to suspect his head, but I shall thank him for the civility of his letter. Another consolation I received from your Lordship was the assurance of so good a force marching to Lancashire, for I do believe the rebels have hopes—though groundless—from thence and Wales, and I hear from a very good hand, that there is a very unpromising coldness at Chester. I send your Lordship the enclosed more as matter of curiosity than useful intelligence, for the information is particular, and seems to be given *naivement*. We had repeated assurances yesterday, that Carlisle had within their walls 15000 able and resolute men, who would not submit tamely. Nothing in the world was more acceptable here than the vigourous and unanimous Resolution of both Houses. I observe no mention of the Declaration of the

[4] This letter is not in the collection.

Chevalier's Nobility, or of the Appeal to the People.—I suppose they were either not received, or nothing thought worth such solemn notice, but what had the sanction of J[acobus] R[ex] or P[ro] R[ex]. I think my scheme of an answer may very well be looked upon as superseded, or, if your Lordship judge it proper to go forth, I believe I need not intimate it must be anonymous, as I have told Say.

I thank the Colonel for his supposed emendation of the skull cap; that shall remain for a soup dish, and the velvet be converted, as was meant, into breeches. Mr Frankland left me yesterday, and purposes to be in town tomorrow. He will be proud to wait upon your Lordship, whenever you are pleased to signify that you have half an hour to spare.

I am with perfect sincerity, My Lord, your Lordships most obliged and affectionate Friend,

THO: EBOR:

I should be ashamed to show Dr Dunstan's letter to any one but yourself, and I send it now on account of its relation to Lancashire.

XXIV.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Novr 20. 1745.

My Lord,—I thank you extremely for your last letter,[5] and the honour of your Lordships judgment with regard to the papers I troubled you with. Mr Say has my orders to commit them to the flames. I am going to York to a sheriffs dinner, and I dont know, but the Trouble-Feasts may spoil our stomachs, or make us scamper. If they come forward on the York Road, I will endeavour to take care of one, and march off Southward. We can certainly make no sort of defence against their depredations, for I cannot tell by what policy or what direction, but our Lord Lieutenants with their respective corps are all in their own Ridings, when, if they are like to be of any significancy, they ought, I should have thought, to have been together.

I heard last post that the Court have had an alarm of risings in Wales, Shropshire, and Chester. This makes me conjecture that the destination of these wolves is through Lancashire. It would be a satisfaction to me if your Lordship would order my good friend the Colonel to acquaint me what truth there is in this, and whether Sir W[atkin] is concerned in it.

It has blown all night, and threatens to blow a great storm. The rebel army lay last night at Penrith.

I am, with great truth and affection, my Lord your Lordships ever,

THO: EBOR.

XXV.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Novr 22 1745

My Lord,—I am just returned from York, where I have been ever since Wednesday morning. It is very necessary that your Lordship

[5] Not in the collection.

should be acquainted with the true state of our City. I have informed myself, not only from my own observation, but from the best evidence, that York is in no sort of condition to make any resistance, if the rebels move this way, and therefore I have given it as my opinion to one of the principal Magistrates, that the best way is to let these people in without hesitation. I hope and believe that none except Papists (if they) are in a disposition to rise up against the King, and that the whole county are loyally affected, and all will be quiet. Upon enquiry of the Recorder, what care had been taken that the arms of the Militia should not fall into the Highlanders' hands, he told me very frankly, there were none of any significance in the City, and that the arms coming from Malton and Birmingham had been countermanded. Our people here are in strange apprehension of mischief from the Papists, and it has been proposed to me that the principal of them should be apprehended and secured. I opposed that for many reasons, but one in stead of every other; that it would be too nice and dangerous a point for us to set such a precedent, and that the necessity or propriety of it ought to come from the Administration. The rebels are come to Penrith, and we are told today that the most advanced party of them are on the Lancashire route to Kendal. It is not to be conceived, how frightful the hurry was in the City of York on Wednesday, while the apprehension was strong that they would take this road. They are a little quieted today by the hopes that they are turned toward Lancashire. If the next express differs from this, and they come this way, not a soul will stay in York that can move from it. If they plunder the City, the loss will be prodigious to the King's subjects, and yet perhaps even that would be better for the public than civil and cajoling usage from them. It is high time that a check was given to this insolence, but it will hardly be in the power of Wade to do it till they have advanced far into Lancashire, for they move with uncommon spirit and rapidity. Your Lordship is a far better judge than I am of the consequences of their getting York and Leeds in this road, or Manchester or Chester in the other. If I am rightly informed, Shrewsbury has shown an inclination to receive them. One thing I am quite sure of, that the attempts of a Militia or new raised forces to preserve these Towns are arrant folly.

Every sensible gentleman whom I converse with in this country sees this matter more in a light the most alarming, and if it be otherwise in London, it is an infatuation that will ruin us. I should think from some of my correspondents to day, that London is in great security, but for my part, I have so strong a sense of the public danger, as Wade is so far off, and so fatigued and encumbered, and Ligonier not come much forward, that, had I my Royal Master's ear, I should think it the duty of an honest man and good subject to tell him that his crown was in danger of being shaken, and that whoever at this juncture could give him contrary advice, either knew nothing as he ought to know, or meant to betray him. This is warm, my Lord, but uttered in no spirit of fear, but from the clearest and strongest evidence.

As to my own safety for the present, I will stay till the last moment, and if any scheme of defence of any likelihood can be formed, I will share in the common danger. If not, I know of no duty that obliges me

to run the hazard of being knocked on the head, or taken prisoner. I stand ready to escape at half an hour's warning, and shall endeavour to do so. This upon supposition that these ruffians take the York road. If they take the other, I am determined to fix my abode and wait the fate of, and as I may, serve, my country here. I have taken the best method I could think of to persuade the Lord Mayor, if he cant stand it out, to fly rather than submit to proclaim the Pretender.

I am, my Lord, your ever obliged and faithful friend,

THO: EBOR:

This morning Nov^{r} 23rd.

Express from Leeds brings certain intelligence that the vanguard of the Highland Army was on Thursday night at Kendal.

Lord Irwin is settled in the E. Riding and sends me word they are securing the persons of the Papists.

XXVI.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe, Nov^{r} 24 1745.

My Lord,—I submit the paragraph under which I have drawn lines in the enclosed letter to your Lordship's consideration. It is a written letter sent hither every post to the Lord Mayor, and passes for their Gospel in politics. It is a very bad passage, and my Lord Duke of N. may possibly think it right to prevent the poison of it. Surely if it be false, it ought to be contradicted by Authority.

I trouble your Lordship too with an account from Sedbergh of the march and figure of these tatterdemalions, which, if true, would give a very contemptible notion of the well affected people in Scotland, and shows them as hardly worthy the notice of an English army. And yet, my Lord, this is not a time to lessen our sense of danger.

Our apprehensions here are gone, and for aught I know, York may for the ensuing month be one of the quietest towns in England, which, after a few sleepless nights, will be a great consolation to,

My Lord, your Lordship's most affectionate and faithful servant,

THO: EBOR:

If your Lordship please, send the enclosed story of the march to my brother of Chichester.

Wade is expected at Boroughbridge on Wednesday or Thursday.

XXVII.

The Same to the Same.

Dec^{r} 4. 1745.

My Lord,—Give me leave to thank you for your last most obliging letter. While the rebels were in the North, I might possibly sometimes give your Lordship some little new or more particular intelligence than you met with in public. The scene of action is now removed, and no

occurrences happen here at all worth your Lordships notice. Wade came on Monday night to Boroughbridge; halted there yesterday, and moves to Wetherby to day. I hear they have done encamping, and their troops are to be cantoned in the towns hereabouts. Fifty Swiss came last night to York. M[r] Hill, my chaplain, who dined yesterday with Wentworth, brings a very good account of the health and spirits of the men, who are under no other apprehensions of fear, but from being sent back again into Scotland, and put upon the hard, and indeed intolerable service of encamping. Some of them have deserted, owing to a foolish report, conveyed to the army by Vane of Raby Castle, that all Lancashire was in arms for the Chevalier. Sure this could not be malice, but it might very well be folly in the reporter. Oglethorpe breakfasted with me, yesterday; as he travels in character, he filled my yard and my house with troopers and hussars, who were prodigiously welcome to my ale and bread and cheese. He complained much of the Dutch, and ascribed the start of our horse to a march to Newcastle at their solicitation, when they could have gone to Hexham directly through Durham, without any inconvenience at all. I heard afterwards that the people below stairs were free in their censures upon them, and speak of them broadly, as a dead weight upon our army, and a set of slothful, dirty, dastardly, pilfering fellows, and indeed Ogle told me, that if only our own people (with the Swiss, of whom all speak well) had been to march, they could easily have been at Manchester on Monday. I only hint these things to your Lordship, who I dare say thinks with me, that England can never be properly defended but by Englishmen. I thank God, they are all such in the D[uke's] army.

Last night eleven fellows were lodged in the Castle. One of them is a gentleman of Northumberland, Clavering by name; the rest are inferior people, one in the D. of Cumberland's livery, his servant in Flanders, another servant to the Lord Kilmarncck's son. They were pushing to their friends in Cheshire, but alarmed the town of Penrith with demanding billets for 1000 men, and went through to Lowther Castle. There they purposed to spend the night, but the militia in Penrith took heart, forty of them followed the gentlemen, attacked them in the house and stables, from whence the rebels fired, and took them, wounded three, eight escaped, among whom was Kilmarnocks son. They took all their horses.

I find Sir Rowland Winn has informed the D. of N. of the doings of one Burton, a physician in York.[6] He is in confinement in the Castle. His character of the worst sort, as to affection to the Government; his journey to Hornby Castle, where he said he was taken by the rebels, very unaccountable, and, as he explains it himself, full of dark and contradictory passages, two particularly of very strong marks of a good correspondence with them, for he sent up a letter to the Chiefs at the Castle, before they had attempted to seize him, and brought off a brace of geldings safe, each worth 20 guineas. This he owns himself. M[r]

[6] The Dr. Slop of *Tristram Shandy*. Notwithstanding his excuses, he was detained in prison for fourteen months. His Jacobitism is sufficiently evinced by a curious pamphlet published at York in 1756 relating to a *fracas* between him and Mr. George Thompson of that city.

York has a small dialogue between him and Charles, which was literally as he delivered it to me and the Recorder. I enclose to your Lordship a letter he sent me from the Castle on Sunday night; I doubt it is the first time in his life that ever he made profession of serving K. George.

My Lord Mayor, I hope, is an honest Magistrate, though a weak one. As to the apprehension from the Pretender's having known that there were arms, I am told my Lord is clear of it, and that the caution dropped from Wood of Lincoln's Inn, who was at the consultation. I will endeavour to find the name of the Alamain Writer, and send it to your Lordship. But the Letter is forbidden for the future. I communicated in proper places your Lordships good account of the Fleet. The Whigs here are sometimes too violent, and take fire at stories of terrible appearance, but no reality. I make it my business to keep up their zeal but temper their prosecutions, and would willingly open my arms at this juncture to receive converted Tories. Your Lordship, I hope, knows better things. I do not like our intelligence from Scotland. Where are the nine, to one of the King's friends? But we hear little from thence, for the past is still under some interruption. I need not intimate to your Lordship that I gave no answer to Burton's letter, but that he was in the hands of the Civil Magistrate.

I am my Lord, your Lordships most obliged and faithful friend,

THO: EBOR:

Your Lordship will please preserve Burton's letter. Your Lordship should know Burton is a silly fellow of no mark or likelihood, and in my own mind I am in much doubt whether this journey of his had not as much or more folly than treason in it. He knows Perth and Maxwell, who was with Elcho at Hornby.

XXVIII.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Dec^{r} 11 1745.

My Lord,— . . . . Dr. Sterne[7] imparts a matter to the Duke by that post of real significancy, as it brings a proof that our physician D^{r} Burton, so far as his influence reaches, is a dangerous and barefaced traitor, as well as he is a bad man. I think your Lordship has a letter of his, wrote to me out of the Castle, professing, in the most solemn manner, an attachment to K. George. How truly these professions were made, the information about him will leave out of all doubt. I am glad he has dropped the mask, for he was a sort of darling of the Party here, and had the direction of a printing press.

Your Lordship would laugh immoderately to see what a resort of people I have here every day. I can easily with a little self conceit fancy myself a kind of Lord President of the North. Now and then the Lords Lieutenants do me the honour to consult me upon their motions, and I have more than once been invited, by way of credit to the thing,

[7] Sterne's uncle, equally conspicuous as a politician and a pluralist: so ardent in the former capacity that, according to his nephew, he disinherited him for refusing to write paragraphs in the newspapers.

(God knows, as they say in Wales) to be present at a review. Expresses come to me with the previous alarm of a horn, from the North and South, and this very day I have had one officer from General Wentworth and another from Oglethorpe with intelligence. What they brought was what your Lordship knows by this time that Oglethorpe and a few hours after him the Duke had got to Preston yesterday, and Wade was marching to the North in three divisions, one by Richmond, the others by Darlington to Newcastle, where, the Officer told me, it was presumed the Dutch would stay, and the English march to Scotland, but that was conjecture. This Gentleman told me that the nobleness of the King to the poor soldiers in the shoes and stockings had been most wickedly abused, insomuch that neither of them, through the villainous job of the contractors, would last a soldier above a day, which, in the worst weather and marches, used to hold out a fortnight. This is horrible, and would mortify a good man exceedingly. The flannel from the Quakers is excellent. Here is a report, that four French transports have been taken and two sunk. I think I mentioned to your Lordship the irregularity of the Edinburgh post, though it has been open a long time, and it is certainly worth some attention to set it right.

I am ever, my Lord, your most faithful Friend,

THO: EBOR:

XXIX.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Decr 20 1745.

My Lord,—I enclose a copy to your Lordship of what I wrote today to Lord Malton by Sir Roland Winn. I did it in order to facilitate the execution of what the D. of Newcastle recommended to Lord Irwin with regard to our Yorkshire companies. There is no occasion for me to enter particularly now with your Lordship into every point of conduct with regard to our county forces and their application; I shall only say, that it was an infelicity to us, that they never could be put under the direction of some one head. For as the lords were distributed into their several Ridings, it was not possible to act, for reasons of distance, with that perfect steadiness and union which was to be desired. Besides that the irregular motions of the enemy, and their hanging so long on their march, over the skirts of the W Riding, the most considerable part of this County, made the councils and resolutions of our Gentlemen very fluctuating. These vermin have now passed our County again. I hope soon to hear that the defeat of their rear guard at Shap will be followed with the total destruction, if it please God, or at least dissolution of their whole force. The point now is to convert our companies to some immediate use to the public, and I will hope, if the Lords set earnestly about it, something may be done. I dare be confident the Lords will do their utmost, but as many of the new raised men are brought up to trades, and many of them sons of wealthy farmers, or such as in the country phrase are well to pass, it will be difficult to persuade them, unless their officers show them the example, which, I am told to day, many of them are inclined to do. As the turn of things has made me a

little confident by them, every ounce of weight that I have shall be employed to serve my Master. Lord Irwin has done us the honour with his seven companies to come to York. They were reviewed in my neighbourhood to day. I walked along their ranks with their colonel, and everybody says they were a set of fine fellows and performed their exercise to admiration. Their Captain did me the honour to dine yesterday at Bishop Thorpe. I am glad your Lordship approved of the cautious step of the Lord Mayor with regard to the gun.

I am ever, my Lord, your Lordships most obliged & faithful

THO: EBOR:

XXX.

The Same to the Same.

Dec^{r} 23 1745.

My Lord,—I send your Lordship a second letter which regards the disposition of our country forces, and hope what is proposed in it will not interfere with the contents of the D. of Newcastles last express to the Lords Lieutenants. Lord Irwin and his friends seem to think it right, and as Lord Scarborough did me the honour to breakfast with me this morning on his way to Hull, I showed it him, and have his approbation. His visit was so long, that I have only time to assure you that I am ever,

My Lord, your Lordship's most faithful

THO: EBOR:

All is safe yet, but I wish the D. had given over his pursuit of these Highwaymen.

XXXI.

The Same to the Same.

York Dec^{r} 23 1745.

My Lord,—Since I wrote to your Lordship in the morning I received the two enclosed letters. They amazed and grieved me much, and as my situation and concern in this business makes it necessary for me to do something, I really dont know what to do. I will endeavour to get as good a meeting at Pomfret as may be on Monday, where it will be, as of great moment, so of the greatest consolation in the world to meet the D. of Newcastle's and your Lordship's secretaries. If you approve of it, let them be directed to Lord Malton, with a copy for my private use, and by all means let a disbanding be prevented. I can neither describe nor conceive the hurt of such a measure here in this county, and such is the opinion of all the sensible gentlemen to whom I have imparted it. Your Lordship may be assured, that I will say or do nothing in this affair in the interim, but in consultation with Lord Irwin, Sir Conyers d'Arcy, and other gentlemen of the first weight. Indeed, my Lord, our friends must be advised rightly from above.

I am, my Lord, your Lordships most faithful friend,

THO: EBOR:

Perhaps the directions his Grace of Newcastle honours us with should be sent to the three L^{d} Lieutenants in conjunction.

XXXII.

The Same to the Same.

Bishop Thorpe Jany 1st 174$\frac{5}{6}$.

My Lord,—At the meeting on Monday, of which I gave your Lordship an account as soon as it was up, it appeared upon enquiry into the fund, that about two thousand pounds of the first call was in arrear, and little come in of the second, so it was pretty obvious and easily agreed to that nothing more should be done at present than publishing the enclosed advertisement. By this means, the business of disbanding and recruiting the King's army are *res integra*. I foresee by what dropped in the debate, that it may be made a question, whether the trust reposed in the Lords Lieutenants will justify the applying the subscription money by way of bounty, but this and every other consideration must be postponed till the subscription comes in, for if that fail, down drops every scheme at once. Though possibly some of the fellows may then be persuaded to 'list, and the officers will endeavour it, yet it must be considered that the greatest part of these men are above being common soldiers, and all of them 'listed for country service under a promise from the gentlemen that they should not be put under military discipline, or sent to the army. As these troops were raised here, with such uncommon generosity, and sure to great purpose, as the County has been preserved in perfect peace, it is my aim, and as they give me permission to speak what I think, it was my instruction to my friend at Pomfret, that for their own popularity and the public good, to which they are the sincerest friends, they would take care to dismiss these troops in such a manner that they may return home in the best humour, and be ready to engage again if ever they were called out on such an occasion, and at present we consider that danger is far from being over. Lord Scarborough with his regiment had got as far as North Allerton on march to the Marshal's army, but was countermanded. The corps is reckoned a good one, is regimented, and the only reason the Marshal gave against receiving them was that Newcastle was too full already; but they might have been cantoned near. The Marshal rejected too ten good men that offered themselves at Boroughbridge, because they were raw men. That is not understood here.

I wish your Lordship joy of the Royal Duke's conduct, which has gained the hearts of all this part of the world. We only lament his not overtaking these villains, which seems owing to some infelicities. Lord Higham is returned to his father, and the Earl is easy. He brought him to me at Pomfret on purpose to tell me the tale of his expedition, which the boy did very sensibly and gracefully, with one particular which the boy did not apply but I did. It was the answer of an old Highlander to the question, Why he brought his son, who was not above fourteen years, into the rebellion? The old fellow said:—'The laddie wonot stay at home, but his spirit was up, as soon as he heard the bagpipes.'

I enclose to your Lordship, to be conveyed, if you please, to the D: of N. a minute from Sir Rowland Winn. He desired, and it was not possible for me to decline it. The Duke knows his importance in this

county, and his steady and useful activity for the King. Pray God send your Lordship and the noble Duke a happier year than the last.

I am, My Lord, your Lordships most faithfully,

THO: EBOR:

XXXIII.

The Same to the Same.

Jan^{y} 6 174$\frac{5}{6}$.

My Lord,—It is easy to foresee that this Ministry will have many applications of the sort enclosed from Sir Rowland, as well as others, and I was very averse to beginning the trouble, but Sir Rowland's consequence in this county and his attachment to the King and his friends made it impossible for me to decline it. Will your Lordship give me leave through your hands to congratulate Lady Hardwicke on the removal of those ruffians by the activity of the Royal Duke; though my Lady would have had a fine opportunity of observing their descent from Highgate had they reached the capital, which I doubt would have been agreeable to the curiosity of some ladies. I hope in God, now they are there, effectual means will be found to keep these wolves locked up in their mountains, for in truth, should they get loose again, and overrun the country, despair and dejection of spirit would hurt the King much more than disaffection. The well affected in Scotland, from some of whom I hear often, grow extremely uneasy again, and complain of a want of Lieutenancys, of which I dont know the meaning. Our dragoons are in the highest contempt with these rascals, runaways are their constant language, and the boys and old women hiss them. I doubt their credit is sunk too in this country, since the infamous behaviour at S^{t} George's, and Blanes at Clifton. That is our account, which I hope the aid de camp knows to be a false one. We are told they are mostly Scotch and Irish, and their misbehaviour, added to our just fears of the Dutch, is matter of some uneasiness to honest people. It is certainly a felicity that Wade did not engage.

Our castle is being full of prisoners, and of so low and dirty a sort, that when the wind sets fair, I can almost fancy that I smell them, as they do the hogs at a distillery. They are so many, that people begin to be apprehensive of them. Part of Oglethorpe's Georgians (he left a hundred here under a terrible captain) are appointed guard, for the Gentlemen of the County have not the best opinion of the Jailor, how justly I cannot say. However, so many persons ought to be well watched. Your Lordship will I am sure forgive me, if I suggest that Ibbotson of Leeds be thought a proper person for High Sheriff at a time that may be full of important business. He is young, healthy, rich, active for the king, prudent, and would like the office.

May the new year arrive upon us with peace and healing in its Wings!

I am, my Lord, your Lordships ever most faithfully,

THO: EBOR:

XXXIV.

The Same to the Same.

Jan^{y} 21 174$\frac{5}{6}$.

My Lord,—It is always matter of the highest satisfaction to me to find your lordship pleased with the situation of our public affairs, for then I am sure we are in a safe, at least hopeful way, and such as every honest and understanding man in the kingdom would wish. M^{r} Yorke is extremely good to me, in often obliging me with parliamentary views, and I dare say your Lordship will easily believe me, when I say I like the relation of things the better for his being the relator. I do in truth receive particular satisfaction in considering the part which he does bear, and the part that, in a course of years, he is like to bear in that great assembly.

The present system of politics, in having a proper regard to the affairs abroad, is very acceptable here, and there is the utmost confidence, that we shall neither overlook our concerns at home, nor stretch ourselves beyond our line, nor help those who will not help themselves. We are in hopes every day of good news from Scotland, and to hear of the arrival of the Hessians, for the Dutch are become extremely odious, and indeed hurtful to the country, and I am very well assured that in towns where their sick have been left, in Leeds particularly, they have spread very mortal distempers.

The Kings friends here are universally pleased with the nomination of our new High Sheriff. He dined with me today, and I find did not want the hint your lordship mentioned. He changes the Jailor for good reasons, and will set himself to the execution of his office with great alacrity, and I hope equal prudence. The prisoners here are many, and under the care of Oglethorpe's Georgians at present. If they should be withdrawn, M^{r} Ibbotson is apprehensive that he should want a military guard to supply their room. I doubt that could not be supplied here, for both the City and County forces will soon be disbanded. The money for the support of the first is almost at an end, and some people think there has been too much dilatoriness used in not disbanding the other some time ago. That is the point which indeed keeps me in the country, and I would willingly contribute to put an happy and popular end to this business. Lord Malton is in London, Sir Conyers not well, and wants much to be there, so that to be sure the county forces will soon be disbanded. There will be then a residue of eight thousand pounds or more in cash; that according to the resolutions at the first meeting should be returned to the subscribers, but if the gentlemen at a public meeting will come into it, I should think the best use of it will be that (and I have more gentlemen of the same opinion) which his Grace of Newcastle has intimated as agreeable to His Majesty and useful to the public, recruiting the King's Army. There is one objection to that stirring in the country, viz. that by advancing bounty moneys you dont benefit the public, but the recruiting officers; an objection that does not weigh with me, for I think it ungenerous, and, in spite of it, shall do what I can to promote the measure, but I think it ought to go with the public approba-

tion. For I am extremely solicitous, and think the nation is in some degree interested in it, that the Yorkshire affair be concluded with as much good temper and popularity as it begun. I have no interest in it at all but for that single consideration, and, but for that reason, would not have pestered your Lordship, at this time of infinite business, with my thoughts about it. Mr Ibbotson tells me that six of their blue coats have listed into Barretts regiment, and I hear many more are disposed to do it. I wish our gentlemen may be able to make the King a present of 1000 men. I acquainted Sir Rowland with your Lordships goodness to him and his brother, and my own acknowledgments go along with theirs. I accept the noble colonels apology for the dragoons with great pleasure. The D. of Richmond had set me right in it before. I own it would mortify me to hear such men are in any sort of apprehension from a gang of thieves.

I saw poor Oglethorpe last night in York. He looks dismally, and I judged of the sore place by his falling instantly upon the affair of Shap.

I am ever, my Lord,

Your Lordship's most obliged and faithful servant,

THO: EBOR:

The Secretary of States answer to the Popish Memorial is an excellent thing. Lord Irwin sent me word he had wrote to my Lord Duke of Newcastle with a proposal to form the men of his Riding into a regiment, but I fancied it would be at present an impracticable thing, as I suppose is so.

I was in hopes I could have regulated my Scotch correspondence without troubling your Lordship, but in fact I find I can't. My Northern letters go from Berwick to London, and back to York by Berwick. If an exception could be procured as to my letters at the Post Office at Berwick, I would make no ill use of the indulgence.

XXXV.

The Same to the Same.

Janr 23 $174\frac{5}{6}$.

My Lord,—We have had large accounts of the disappointments at Falkirk. It gives me some concern (as I hear it was known in town on Monday) that no history of the day has come from the Government. Our story is bad enough in all conscience, but this silence above makes one suspect more. That event proves if the enemy is not too brave or too numerous for us, he is at least too cunning, and it is for them an happy issue, of what here is appearance of an ignominious flight. I am not particular in my opinion, but from laying circumstances together I always thought, though I dared not declare it, that there was more of art than fright in their retreat out of England, and have thanked God twenty times that they did not turn upon the Duke, and it is a fact most certain, that they traversed Scotland more like conquerors than fugitives, and are now in great strength and credit, and though I dont believe the report which makes them twelve thousand, I am very much afraid those dont know their precise number who, one would wish, did. The behaviour

of Hamiltons dragoons is quite intolerable, and I have pretty good authority to say, that but three of all the foot regiments did their duty, and that some of them did not stand to fire once. It is a certain fact that the runaway dragoons, who have been the hissing and scorn of old women these three months, were at the gates of Edinburgh by eight o'clock on Friday evening, though the battle did not end till after six. I am afraid of meddling, but I cannot help observing to your Lordship on this occasion the ill conduct of the Gazette. It is certainly of public importance that that paper dont lose its credit. It has been found much fault with here, and yesterday more particularly, when people read there, that the whole body of the rebels was in the utmost panic and confusion at Stirling on the 14th, and on the 14th it appears they were in condition to attack and drive the King's whole forces.

I enclose a strange letter received yesterday from Ireland. The anonymous is ignorant, but I doubt speaks the true spirit of Popery, and shows they are making observations. Since that new incident from the North, I would beg leave to crave your Lordships judgment as to our county troops. I have by this post intimated to Sir Conyers, and Sir Rowland, and Lord Irwin, that the disbanding scheme had better be suspended, but if his Grace of Newcastle pleases to advise that still, and recommend the experiment of recruiting the King's army, I will with pleasure pursue those directions, but I fancy the Duke would mean it should be done with the approbation and good temper of the County, not otherwise. God forbid the story of a rising in Sussex should be true. It is not yet known here publicly, when it is, if it prove true, one would rather augment, if possible, than disband the county forces, for though they cannot oppose a regular force, they will employ indigent and idle people, awe the Papists, and are more than a match for any home commotions.

I am ever, My Lord, your Lordships most faithful and affectionate

THO: EBOR:

I am quite sensible of the impropriety of my meddling in these military matters, but as one Lord Lieutenant is in London, another laid up with the gout, and a third, to speak plainly, sick of the service, all differing in opinion, and all referring to me, I will do my best with my Lord Duke's and your Lordship's directions. The fund will maintain through three months.

I trouble your Lordship to turn over just to say that Count Nassau dined with me here yesterday; that he seemed aghast at the Scotch news; that he is coming to London for instructions, having left provisional orders for his lieutenant in case of danger. He blames Wade much for his halting so long at Leeds and Wakefield at the retirement of the rebels, and Wade, I have heard, lays as much blame on him. He said he was ready for action at all times and places. His men are recovering apace, and he told me 800 quartered at Guisborough in Cleveland were well, and, what I was pleased to hear, very acceptable to the people there. It was chiefly at Leeds that I heard they were much otherwise. Your Lordship will please to preserve the Irish letter.

N.B.—Wade and other officers of the old Army were grown sluggish and timid. The Duke's activity and mettle put another spirit into them.

XXXVI.

The Same to the Same.

Wetherby, Jan^{y} 26 174$\frac{5}{6}$.

My Lord,—Just before I sat down to dinner to day the Kings messenger came in with notice that the Duke would be here to night. I ordered my coach immediately to pay my duty to his R. Highness, and got here by six, about ten minutes before him. He is going to lie down for an hour or two, and does me the honour to take my coach to Boroughbridge about one in the morning. After I had kissed his hand and wished him a good journey, I took the liberty to desire him to take care of himself, and intimated, that we wanted no proof of his spirit and intrepidity.

My good friend the Colonel has just parted with me. He seems extremely well; is as confident as a modest man should be of success, and talks of the ragged enemy with a very cool contempt. I pray God grant that this expedition may put an entire stop to the mischief of this diabolical crew. That this harassed nation may come to itself again and enjoy a little, I mean a lasting repose. I have troubled your Lordship so much lately that I am ashamed to pester you by this post.

I am My Lord, ever your Lordships most faithfully,

THO: EBOR:

By my last intelligence from Edinburgh I learn that my friend Sir Arch^{d} Grant brings up all his children Jacobites, and that one Jack, whom your Lordship once mentioned in a letter, is a man to be trusted with great caution. *Gens infida!*

The Records of the Commissione Feudale in the Neapolitan Archives.

A COLLECTION of very great interest is that contained in the Archivio di Stato at Naples, in the division 'Interno,' section 'Commissione Feudale.' It comprises 96 printed volumes and over 5,000 bundles of manuscripts, all easily handled when once the key to the system has been discovered. They constitute the fundamental record of titles to land throughout what was formerly the kingdom of Naples, and are daily referred to by Neapolitan lawyers and a small staff of officials.

The history of this remarkable collection of documents is shortly as follows: In 1806 Joseph Bonaparte and Masséna drove King Ferdinand out of his kingdom of Naples. Napoleon's brother was shortly afterwards proclaimed king, and immediately began to reform the institutions of the country in accordance with the French system. Feudalism, though nominally suppressed a few years earlier, was still in full force,[1] and there was a congestion of

[1] See among other authorities Zurlo's *Rapporto* for 1808.

feudal litigation between the barons and the *università* or townships. One of the chief objects of Joseph and his ministers was to abolish extravagant feudal rights, to redeem reasonable ones, to free commerce and communications, and to transform customary occupation and long tenures into free peasant proprietorship. But to follow a strict legislative course of reform would clearly have been nugatory. The Neapolitan lawyers, according to Giannone and Ammirati, were the most subtle feudal lawyers in Europe, and there were already cases pending that had been in dispute before the numerous tribunals for very many years, in some cases for centuries. Merely to add new laws to those already existing would obviously have been pouring oil on the flames. Decrees were therefore issued, the first during the reign of Joseph Bonaparte, the last during that of his successor, Joachim Murat, constituting a special feudal commission. This court was to decide finally and without appeal all actions concerning feudal rights which were then pending before any tribunal, or which might be begun before it. It was to base its decisions on the laws of the French kings, regardless of all precedent, and these decisions were to be final. In cases of great complication, where endless delay might be expected, Count Zurlo, Joachim's able minister of the interior, instructed the court that it was to find some short cut to a conclusion that should do reasonable justice to both parties.

The feudal commission, presided over by Dragonetti, came into existence in December 1808,[2] and concluded its labours in 1811. During that period it disposed of over 5,000 cases, represented by the bundles of manuscripts now in the Archivio di Stato under the general heading 'Interno, 41, Commissione Feudale.' In view of the importance of the work of the court as resettling so many titles to land it was decided to place the record in print. In 1808 a beginning was made of printing the decisions in a series of volumes entitled *Bollettino delle Sentenze emanate della Suprema Commissione per le liti fra i già Baroni ed i Comuni*, and *Supplimento del Bollettino della Commissione Feudale*, Napoli, 1808–1859; 72 vols. 8vo. In addition to this the publication was begun in 1858, but was abandoned in 1867 at the letter L of the *Bollettino delle Ordinanze de' Commissarj Ripartitori de' Demanj ex feudali e comunali nelle Province dei RR.DD. al di quà del Faro. In appendice degli atti eversivi della feudalità*, Napoli, 1858–1867, 24 vols. 8vo. These last-named volumes are a collection of reports made by the travelling commissioners of the feudal commission, among whom was that eminent jurist D. Winspeare, who has left some account of these matters in his useful book *Storia degli Abusi Feudali*. These 96 volumes are not to be found, so far as I know, in any library

[2] Decree, 3 Dec. 1808.

outside Naples; neither the British Museum nor the Bibliothèque Nationale possesses a copy. The working key to the whole collection is vol. lxxii. (consecutive numbering); from this as a starting point every volume and every bundle of manuscripts can be conveniently handled.

The extraordinary range of the feudal rights covered in these cases may be partly realised from the two following facts: (1) that many of the bundles of manuscripts contain documents carrying titles back as far as original grants by the Norman dukes (for instance, *Supplimento*, xxxii. 12), and (2) that Zurlo ordered a schedule to be printed of 1,400 feudal rights specifically abolished under decrees of Joseph and Joachim. This list is now rare to find, but is reproduced in Winspeare's *Abusi Feudali*, where it may be readily consulted.

I have made partial use of this collection for the limited purpose of ascertaining the conditions existing at the period of the French conquest in 1806, but there is ample and apparently untouched material here for students more directly interested in the study of feudalism and the growth and character of feudal rights.

R. M. Johnston.

Reviews of Books

Les Celtes depuis les Temps les plus Anciens jusqu'en l'An 100 *avant notre Ere.* Par H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE. (Paris: Fontemoing. 1904.)

THIS little volume of 220 pages contains a course of lectures given recently at the Collège de France. Its subject is excellently described by its title: it summarises the history of the two branches of the Celts, the Goidels and the Brythons, or Gallo-Britons, down to the epoch when they come within the range of Roman influences and conquests. In the main it is an etymological study of proper names, combined with scattered facts known to us through archæology or written history, and it ought to be reviewed by a Celtic scholar rather than by a student of Roman history. It is, however, a summary restating in clear, terse fashion of the results obtained by its distinguished author in previous and larger works, and suitably to its character it is provided with few footnotes or references. It may therefore be permitted me to say that, so far as I can judge, it provides an admirable account of an obscure and difficult topic, and deserves the notice of those concerned with the Roman Republic. It also opens pleasant *aperçus*, as in the suggestion (p. xi) that 'there is probably much more Gaulish blood in Germany than in France,' reinforced, half a page further on, by the suggestion that, conversely, there may be more German blood in France than in Germany.

For English readers it may perhaps be interesting to indicate briefly what this pre-eminent Celtic scholar thinks the most probable account of the Celts in early Britain, though some of it is not unfamiliar. Two waves of Celts washed over Britain. The first, of Goidels, arrived in the bronze age about 800 B.C., in search of Cornish tin to make their bronze. They settled in both England and Ireland, and finding both agreeable, they named them the Equally Agreeable Islands, *Cassiteras*. Hence the product of Cornwall, tin, came to be called *κασσίτερος*, just as copper got its name from Cyprus. The second wave, Gauls of the Belgic stock, came six centuries or so later, somewhere about 150 B.C. They can be distinguished from the Goidels not only by well-known philological differences, but also by their habit of wearing pantaloons (*bracae*). Their language was adopted by the Goidels and other inhabitants (if any) whom they found in England. Goidelic survived only in Ireland. England was Brython: even the Picts and the Silures, who have been considered fragments of pre-Celtic races, must be classed as Brythonic. But some

Goidelic elements survived, notably the whole Druidic system and the worship of the deities Nodons (at Lydney) and Brigantia (in north Britain). I will risk one or two criticisms on these views. And first one may doubt whether even MM. d'Arbois de Jubainville and Reinach have really solved the etymology of *κασσίτερος*. Their theory is quite possible. But if, as the book before me says (p. 19), the Phoenicians had already exploited the Cornish mines before the Goidels came, the name for tin should be Phoenician and not Celtic. And if the British Isles were once called *Cassiteras* it is strange that we have no other trace besides a Greek name for tin. Thirdly, the scanty archæological evidence hardly seems to justify either Phoenician trade or Cornish mining so early as B.C. 800. Indeed, I think the archæological evidence might be more fully regarded in a treatise which comes down to B.C. 100. The Late Celtic art had then arisen. Sites like the Glastonbury lake village were then inhabited, though the persistent omission, by those concerned with this village, to publish the results has so far made this particular discovery useless to science. In detail let me add that the list of the Brigantia inscriptions on p. 35 is incomplete, and one of those cited is needlessly put in Caledonia; the invasion of western Britain by the Irish can hardly be as early as the third century; the 'Periplus' of Avienus cannot safely be attributed to Himilco (p. 81), and the statement that the emigration from Noricum Ripense included only the rich (p. 134) does not fit the phrases of Eugippius. F. HAVERFIELD.

The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero. By BERNARD W. HENDERSON, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. (London: Methuen. 1903.)

THIS is a book of great learning and painstaking accuracy. Mr. Henderson has not only made himself acquainted with all that has been written on the subject in ancient and modern times, but he has brought to the study of these materials independence of judgment and a vivid historic imagination. The style, which at first seems somewhat cumbrous, brightens up as he advances; and when he has to deal with striking episodes, such as the murder of Britannicus or of Agrippina, or the campaign of Corbulo, the writer's language takes fire and carries us along all the more completely because of a certain self-restraint which is never wholly lost. Military details are more than usually clear, and we know no better account of the Armenian question and Parthian war, or of the Jewish and British revolts. In the latter in particular the writer has taken an independent line, differing from Mommsen in maintaining that Suetonius did not remain at Chester, but marched on London, and from other authorities in placing the battle with Boadicea near Wroxeter rather than between London and Colchester. That he has proved this it would be too much to say, but he has at least made it appear probable by a narrative which is both reasonable and picturesque. The account of Nero's Italian and provincial administration is instructive, though to our mind too favourable to the emperor; but the discussion of his finance is less complete and certainly minimises its failure. The notes, which with appendices and bibliography occupy eighty-four pages, might in many

cases have been more conveniently placed at the foot of the page. They contain a full citation of authorities, with shrewd and often amusing comments. We do not always agree with them, but we are always interested. We are quite unable, for instance, to accept his interpretation of *qui fatebantur* in the celebrated Tacitean account of the Christian martyrs.[1] The confession seems to us clearly to refer to Christianity and not to incendiarism. We hold that this view is supported by the general run of the passage and by the similar language of Pliny, besides being in itself infinitely more probable and reasonable. If, as Mr. Henderson assumes, the fire was accidental, or if it was begun by agents of the emperor, why should they confess to incendiarism? Nor does it seem likely that vague talk about the day of judgment should have been mistaken for a confession of such a crime. Not even to extenuate Nero's revolting cruelty, by giving him the credit for an honest mistake, can such an interpretation be admitted.

This naturally leads us to the criticism of the book which will most generally be made and will probably excite the greatest interest. Mr. Henderson disclaims holding a brief for Nero, nor does he deny most of the actions or personal habits commonly attributed to him. Nevertheless the book is practically a vindication. He dwells again and again upon his early years, the golden *quinquennium*, his fair promises to the senate, the sagacity of his provincial administration, the stern repression of dishonest or tyrannical government in the provinces, his wise modification of fiscal burdens, the absence of executions at Rome, and the discouragement of informers, his insight in selecting able men and successful officers, his courage and resourcefulness in confronting dangers in east or west. We are asked to believe that a boy of seventeen, without previous training or experience, suddenly developed a surprising genius for government, and for six years carried out the administration of a great empire with a success and a skill which would have done honour to the most accomplished veteran. Yet during these years of early manhood and of able rule occurred the cold-blooded murders of the young Britannicus (poisoned under the emperor's eyes at his own table), of his mother in circumstances of nameless horror, and of his aunt, soon to be followed by that of his neglected and persecuted wife. Nor were these things accompanied by any conspicuous devotion to imperial business. His passion for music, the stage, and the circus—harmless in itself—seemed to absorb his best energies. The pleasures of the table, the vanity of the literary dilettante, the flattery of mistresses and favourites were more to him than affairs of state. And yet in the intervals of this serious pursuit of pleasure or art he ruled an immense empire with courage, sagacity, and success! We venture to think that, if it was so, we are contemplating a miracle almost beyond imagination.

The sober fact is that, like other princes, Nero has been credited with what belonged to his ministers. It is easy to point out Seneca's weaknesses, his sentimentalities and inconsistencies, but after all he was wise and humane; while Burrus seems to have been one of those men who serve the state without the reward of fame, with a steady, silent fidelity. Against him the voice of slander even in Rome was hushed, and the

[1] *Ann.* xv. 44.

change which followed his death is an eloquent testimony to what the empire had owed him. But let the fact that Nero was wise enough to leave business to them be set down to his sagacity rather than to his idleness: let the success of these five years even be credited to him alone. Still merely as an administrator there remains much to be said against him. If he selected Corbulo he practically superseded him by the incapable Paetus. If he lightened taxation, or arranged it more equitably, he reduced the treasury to bankruptcy and was fain to have recourse to that last measure of financial ineptitude, the debasement of the coinage. If he protected the interests of the provinces by the stern punishment of peccant governors, he does not seem to have had any foresight or taken any personal interest in them until his attention was roused by some scandal or disaster; at any rate neither in Germany, nor Britain, nor Judaea were his appointments or his policy successful. Still in attributing successes to the emperor and disasters to his ministers and generals Mr. Henderson perhaps does not go beyond other hero-worshippers.

Unfortunately this requires the depreciation of opponents and victims. 'Nero has served the empire, and no prejudice can deny the fact,' is his general comment upon the foreign policy of the reign. This makes up for everything. The cause of Rome is the cause of civilisation: its triumph is a triumph over barbarism, violence, and crime. He has only a sneer for nations 'rightly struggling to be free,' whether Jew or Briton. The cause of Rome is the cause of Providence, and Nero worthily upholds it. This being so, the writer naturally decries all who seek to end the rule of such a prince. It is the old excuse of a despot mild, merciful, and righteous soured by useless and causeless opposition. We may regret his subsequent severities, but the victims had unfortunately taken up a false position towards a beneficent ruler and suffered accordingly.

> We, so tender in our humanity, so righteous in our indignation, cry aloud in wrath *at the little stream of death, mainly of rebels and traitors*, which flows at the bidding of a prince turned tyrant by the traitors' baffled scheming, and we shut our eyes to the great river of sacrifice and bloody warfare, which had its sole source in that prince's death.

This is Mr. Henderson's summing up of the case, in which he skilfully minimises his hero's atrocities by contrast with war (as has often been done in regard to the Reign of Terror in France), and by implying unworthiness in his victims. But to support his thesis he has first of all to include all kinds of people, likely and unlikely, in the Pisonian conspiracy, Seneca himself being hardly allowed his *not proven*. Corbulo, again—on whose merits he is almost lyrical in the account of the Parthian war—is curtly dismissed at p. 388, not indeed with a positive statement of his guilty connexion with another plot, but with a clear hint that such is the writer's opinion.

> There was a plot, and Corbulo's son-in-law was its mainstay. Nero had reasons for suspicion against Corbulo and others. Corbulo confessed that he might have known what would happen [a rather forced construction, by the way, of the historic ἄξιος]. Corbulo and the others were made to die.

What Mr. Henderson calls the 'Neronian legend' he attributes to the necessity felt by the Flavian dynasty of blackening the last of the

Julian line, and to the vengeance of the Christians upon their first persecutor. But Vespasian's principate was modelled expressly on the rights secured by the Julians, and the worst that we know of Nero comes from writers who had no sympathy with Christianity. This conjectural interpretation cannot shake the opinion that the facts as we know them do not admit of Nero's restitution to the ranks of ordinary humanity. Excuses may be urged on the score of youth, artistic temperament, the corrupting influence of absolute power, the moral decadence of the age, the bloodthirsty temper of the people of Rome, and the like; but all of these put together cannot alter the conviction that in a cruel age Nero was supremely cruel, in a corrupt age supremely corrupt, among despotic rulers pre-eminent for the abuse of power in wreaking private vengeance. Mr. Henderson pleads that detestation of private vices should not blind us to a man's excellencies as a ruler. But were they *his* excellencies? When the period of good rule coincides with the presence of certain advisers, of whom otherwise we have reason to think well, and at their disappearance is changed to a bewildering scene of bloodshed, suspicion, and tyranny, we have some reason to dispute Nero's personal share in the earlier and better period.

Mr. Henderson holds that Nero was really averse to bloodshed and with refined Hellenic taste disliked the brutalities of the arena. His passion for the theatre and his appearances on the stage, which scandalised his contemporaries, may be dismissed with a smile of half scorn and half pity for a third-rate artist posing as a genius, but the effect of this Hellenic refinement in softening the heart received a strange comment from the burning bodies in his gardens. By an old Roman law arson was punishable by burning, and public sentiment would not have been shocked by these Christians suffering for their supposed complicity in the great fire. But the most callous of rulers have generally turned their eyes from the actual execution of their cruel sentences. What is the refinement worth that could think of them as adding grace to an appearance in gala costume before his people? Family murders, we suppose, must be passed over lightly. They have not prevented much Christian laudation of a Constantine and a Philip II. But it requires something more than irritation at a sentimental Stoic opposition to excuse a score of executions that stained Nero's later years.

Against these crimes we are bidden to set his public achievements: his generals secured Armenia, Britain, Judaea. We must pass over what can be said in favour of liberty in view of the blessings of Neronian rule. The Britons must be regarded as the merest savages, the Jews as fanatics whose tradition of independence was a foolish and criminal dream. Nationalist risings in Gaul are useless rebellion against the providential order of the universe. Yet, if we would try to see with the eyes of contemporaries, there is something to be said for those who did not feel that their highest interests were being served by the presence of Roman legionaries, with their usual train of public and private outrages, for which redress was always difficult and often impossible. Standing outside these events, and looking back on the track of world history, we may perceive that the benefits of Roman domination exceeded its evils. To the conquered and harassed nations it was not so evident. It was at

least of supreme importance to them that there should be a firm central authority, determined to secure to them, if not freedom, yet an equitable, a bearable servitude. Nero's contribution to this was the punishment of a few oppressive governors with infinitely lighter penalties than were inflicted for an unfavourable criticism of his poetry or his voice, for an injudicious admiration of historical heroes, or for the possession of property worth confiscating. The celebrated grant of 'freedom' to Achaia was a freak of sentimentalism as injudicious as it was illusory. Personal vanity, the vanity of the third-rate artist and minor poet, had more to say to it than any gleam of statesmanship or any generous admiration for a once great people.

It will take more, in short, than such a measure, even with the addition of his promotion of the canal across the isthmus, which has been completed in accordance with his plans eighteen centuries after his death—it will take more than such evidence of foresight to convince us that the world has been wrong in attributing to Nero an incapacity and frivolity almost as marked as his viciousness and cruelty. When the danger arose which cost him his power and life, it is difficult to decide which was the more conspicuous—the want of any serious grasp of the situation or the want of courage in facing it. 'Such an artist too!' It was all that was wanted to make the grovelling wretch as ridiculous as he was odious. To relieve his memory of much that has made it an object of execration, Mr. Henderson has to adopt several well-known methods of whitewashing—denial of the facts, pleading evil influence, depreciating popular sentiment. Thus he scoffs at the story of the poisoning of Burrus and the fatal violence to Poppaea, both of which are regarded as true by all our authorities (though of the former Tacitus indicates a doubt). Other brutalities are attributed to the baneful influence of wife or minister rather than to the cruelty of the prince. Thus it was to the jealousy of Poppaea and the sinister influence of Tigellinus that Octavia was sacrificed; it was her own violence and ambition that were fatal to Agrippina; it was their unreasonable sentimentalism that fixed the doom of the Stoics; it was their own want of caution joined to the ignorant passions of the mob that brought the Christians to the stake. In all such cases a clement and generous prince was acting against his natural inclinations. Lastly Mr. Henderson has a sneer ready for sentimental judgments in cases which now shock our common humanity. A conspicuous instance is his treatment of the story of the murder of Pedanius Secundus by one of his slaves, and the consequent execution, in accordance with an ancient law, of the whole household, amounting to 400 persons. This gives him the opportunity of deriding 'careless and hysterical tirades about the rights of man,' and of recording in complimentary or at any rate in complacent terms the emperor's firmness in resisting the popular demand for mercy, and in lining the road by which the 400 (men, women, and children) went to their death with imperial guards. No doubt Nero had with him in this case the feelings of the older and more conservative senators and the great mass of the men of property, who all owned slaves. No doubt laws are laws. There are some things, however, about which it is good to be even hysterical. Slavery is one of them, and above all Roman slavery. Mr. Henderson says: 'It is not to be doubted that very many slaves in

Rome had kind masters and lived happily enough. The very number and wealth of the freedmen prove that their chances of enfranchisement, as of riches, were not small.' This is an old paradox. In Rome the slave population largely exceeded the free. Of course there were kind masters, and of course the higher class of slaves, generally of Greek origin, being useful to their masters in a hundred ways, and possessing those accomplishments which ameliorate life, were apt from gratitude or convenience to be raised to a better status and to form a professional rather than a servile class. But such men, after all, were a small minority. The position of the great majority was miserable and hopeless. For the country slave there were shackles and the nameless horrors of the *ergastulum*; for all alike there was the chance of capricious cruelty for which there would be no redress, and of every kind of outrage from the rod to the scourge and the cross. It was not perhaps to be expected that Nero should rise above his age and show mercy; but neither was it worth while to regard it as a kind of princely magnanimity on his part 'sternly to rebuke' the threatening mob, the very existence of which shows that there was at any rate a widely spread dislike to such butcheries. It is the inevitable result of the wish to place such a man as Nero in as fair a light as may be that something must be done, not only to show that he was no worse than his contemporaries, but also that the worst institutions of his time have something to say for themselves.

Enough has been said on the points in which we differ from Mr. Henderson; a word must be added in conclusion on the excellences of the book. On the highly satisfactory nature of the chapters on the war in Armenia and in Britain we have already remarked; that on 'Philosophy and Pleasure' contains as good an account of Seneca's views as their nebulous nature admits, and there is a more than usually successful essay on 'Persius and Petronius.' The appendix on 'Christianity and the Government,' though containing some interpretations from which we dissent, is extremely able and remarkably concise, considering the great variety of views which the author discusses and the number of authorities to which he refers. The chapter which rests on these researches is less convincing. Perhaps it is impossible to formulate any account of early Christianity in Rome which would seem complete or self-evident. Mr. Henderson has done well to show the poverty of the evidence and the darkness which rests on the *origines* of Christianity. The appendix on the ancient authorities is in every way satisfactory. The illustrations, sixteen in number, are interesting. Among them are busts of Agrippina, Poppaea, Corbulo, Seneca, and six of Nero himself, which make it still more difficult to believe in his good looks or his good qualities.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

Essai sur le règne de l'Empereur Aurélien (270–275). Par LÉON HOMO. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. lxxxix. (Paris: Fontemoing. 1904.)

THIS recent addition to the series of monographs published by the French Schools of Athens and Rome is the work of a scholar who has already contributed to the history of the third century A.D. a dissertation on Claudius Gothicus, to which the present volume forms

a natural sequel. We welcome it as a meritorious and painstaking study of a very important crisis in imperial history. The collection of inscriptions relating to Aurelian which is given in Appendix iii. is especially useful, and, so far as we can see, complete up to date; we should have been glad, however, to find greater consistency in the indication of details. Thus we find no note of the fact that Aurelian's name is erased in *C. I. L.* v. 4319 (Brixia), though a similar case in an inscription of Moesia (*C. I. L.* iii., suppl. 7586) is duly noted. The conventions of the *C. I. L.*, too, are not always strictly observed. The student of Aurelian's reign, however, while he must be grateful to M. Homo for his chapters, based as they are on a very thorough study of the monumental and literary sources, will not always find a decisive solution of the difficult problems which beset the historian of the third century. It may be well to note one or two such cases.

1. In the transformation of Roman society which, though consummated under Diocletian and Constantine, had long been in progress, an important landmark is furnished by the change in the position of the *collegia* or trade-guilds. From privileged bodies they gradually became transformed into corps of state servants, in which membership was hereditary and from which there was no escape—a development which exactly parallels that of the municipal senates. The final step seems (from the evidence of the Codex Theodosianus) to have been taken early in the fourth century; but there is good reason to think that Aurelian played an important part in paving the way. The evidence is to be found in a passage of John of Nikiou (p. 416, ed. Zotenberg) relating to the building of the walls of Rome, which appears to have escaped the notice of M. Homo. The great extension of the system by which food was distributed to the populace of the capital no doubt also led to the further regulation of the corporations in whose hands the supply lay, and it is probably true to speak of the reign of Aurelian rather than, with Liebenam, of that of Severus Alexander as marking an epoch in the history of these bodies. M. Homo does not discuss the question.

2. The precise nature of Aurelian's measures for the reform of the currency is exceedingly difficult to determine, and we can hardly blame M. Homo for his failure to produce a convincing solution of the problems involved. He writes, however, of the so-called *Antoninianus* in a manner which might seem to imply that no doubt existed as to the meaning and origin of the term, whereas the discussions of the question by Kubitschek (whom he does not name) and others have made it impossible to maintain the conventional view without due allowance for the conjectural nature of its foundation. Nor can we admit that M. Homo's view as to the relation between gold and silver coinage established by Aurelian (based on that of Mommsen) is tenable. It is not strictly true to say that the *Antoniniani* of 274 and later bear the mark of value 'XX or XXI,' which is explained as an approximation to the true value, $20\frac{5}{6}$ (sc. *denarii*). XX·I is not to be explained as 21, but as 20=1; this is proved by the analogy of I·L. [50 aurei = 1 pound of gold] on the aureus Rohde, No. 25. The meaning of the equation involves a further question, but, however we answer it, M. Homo's view falls to the ground.

These instances will show that M. Homo's book cannot be said to satisfy all the demands which the student will make. We may also note that he assumes without discussion facts which cannot be called certain—*e.g.* that the Imperium Galliarum was no longer held by Victorinus on the accession of Aurelian, and that the title of Augusta (Σεβαστή) was borne by Zenobia previously to the convention of 270 between Rome and Palmyra. On the other hand, M. Homo shows that he is capable of a full and lucid exposition of disputed points—*e.g.* as to the separation of civil and military powers, pp. 145 sqq.; and we hope to see much valuable work from his pen on the obscure period which he has chosen as his subject of study.

H. Stuart Jones.

Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern. Von D. Karl Holl, A.O. Professor der Kirchengeschichte in Tübingen. (Leipzig: Mohr. 1904.)

Dr. Holl, well known to students of patristic literature by his contributions to Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, as well as by other writings, has, in the course of preparing for a new and much needed edition of Epiphanius, been drawn into by-paths of doctrinal history, and one result is his conviction that historians have not made enough of the importance of Amphilochius of Ikonium.

Amphilochius, the cousin of Gregory of Nazianzus, and the intimate and trusted friend both of Gregory and of Basil, is undoubtedly one of the most interesting figures of an interesting period; and, in his brightly written account of the man's life and labours, Dr. Holl has succeeded in making him stand out even more clearly and strongly than Lightfoot did in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. He seems to us to establish his contentions in matters which have been previously disputed concerning Amphilochius—notably, let us say, in regard to the action taken by Amphilochius against the Messalians or Euchites. In the onslaught upon these strange ascetics Dr. Holl thinks that he was not, as Tillemont and Salmon and (more doubtfully) Bonwetsch have supposed, following the example of Flavian at Antioch, but rather the opposite; and his reasons appear to be adequate. But the importance of Dr. Holl's book lies not so much in his elucidation of points in the career of Amphilochius as in his contributions to the knowledge of Amphilochius as a writer. Hitherto, all that has been generally acknowledged as his are the *Iambi ad Seleucum*, an *Epistula Synodica* on the Macedonian controversy, and a number of *Fragments*. These fragments Dr. Holl has examined with a care which has never been exercised before, and the result is that a large proportion of them must cease to be regarded as coming from the hand of Amphilochius. But the reverse is the case with regard to the *Sermons* of Amphilochius. The critics have never been disposed to consider genuine the discourses ascribed to him in various collections. Lightfoot dismisses them 'all or most' of them as 'seeming to be spurious.' One point is interestingly brought out by Dr. Holl. It is that none of the extant *Fragments* is taken from any of the *Sermons* hitherto supposed to be by Amphilochius. This state of things is now changed. Dr. Holl has had the good fortune to discover in the library at

Munich one of the sermons from which extracts are given, as from Amphilochius, by Theodoret and by Facundus. It is a sermon on the prayer of our Lord in Gethsemane. The sermon is of importance as containing, worked out with greater elaboration—and perhaps more unattractively—than in any formerly known writing, the idea that our Lord feigned to be afraid of death in order to entice death or Satan to assail Him. With the help of this recovered sermon, Dr. Holl is in a position to vindicate Amphilochius's claim to the authorship of six of the other sermons. The grounds on which they have been condemned before are shown to be of a very slight character, and Amphilochius must henceforth take his place again as a considerable writer.[1] Incidentally, Dr. Holl's researches have thrown light upon the antiquities of the Christian year. Amphilochius becomes the earliest witness for the festival of the Purification (2 Feb.) and of the μεσοπεντηκοστή, and makes it certain that Christmas (25 Dec.) had been lately introduced from Rome into Asia Minor.

The rest (more than half) of Dr. Holl's book is only of interest to the specialist in the history of doctrine; and here perhaps more exception might be taken to his conclusions. Although he points out how great was the debt of the Cappadocian divines to Origen—largely through the tradition established by Gregory Thaumaturgus—he does not sufficiently recognise that their teaching on the Trinity had very little novelty in it, and that such language as μία οὐσία—τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις had been used long before Basil was born. A. J. MASON.

Histoire de France. Publiée sous la direction de M. ERNEST LAVISSE. Tome I. i. Tableau de la Géographie de la France. Par P. VIDAL DE LA BLACHE. Tome II. i. Le Christianisme, les Barbares, Mérovingiens et Carolingiens. Par C. BAYET, C. PFISTER, et A. KLEINCLAUSZ. Tome V. i. 1492–1547. Tome V. ii. 1519–1559. Par H. LEMONNIER. (Paris: Hachette. 1903–4.)

THE instalments published during the past academic session of M. Lavisse's co-operative *History of France* bring out with almost excessive clearness the wide view of the province of history which is a special characteristic of the modern French school. The first of the half-volumes before us is not narrowly 'historical' at all. In it M. Vidal de la Blache, the eminent professor of geography at the University of Paris, gives a very remarkable picture of the physical geography of France as the long-delayed first portion of the whole work. On the utility of such a geographical introduction to history it is needless to expatiate, and it is equally unnecessary to emphasise in any detail the masterly way in which M. Vidal has worked out in his most interesting and instructive volume the close relations between the soil of his country and its various inhabitants. Numerous and thoroughly workmanlike

[1] Dr. Holl may be glad to learn that a sentence from this sermon (Holl, p. 98, l. 21, foll.) is given without name in the string of comments on Luke xxii. 40 printed by Migne under the name of Dionysius of Alexandria. The compiler has changed the first person into the third, and substituted θεῖκοῖς (or his copyists and editors for him) for Amphilochius's δειλοῖς.

sketch maps break the general rule of the series against illustration, and lighten the not always easy task of following the closely packed details of M. Vidal's text. To many familiar with French historical writings this volume will seem written in what is to them almost a new language, and a larger knowledge of geology than falls to the lot of all students of history is desirable for its complete assimilation. It is perhaps permitted to confess that the present writer has found the descriptions easier to take in when they concern those parts of France with which he has fairly complete acquaintance than in those of which his knowledge is more superficial. And it may also be allowed to doubt whether M. Vidal has quite conclusively proved the thesis with which he starts his treatise, the doctrine namely that *La France est une être géographique*, whereby he strives to localise in scientific fashion Michelet's well-known dictum *La France est une personne*. After all, the characteristics of variety, the meeting-place of north and south, of ocean and sea, and so on, suggest that, like the nation itself, the lands which the French occupy are but assigned to them by a long series of historical accidents; and that the true geographical unity of France is more poetic than scientific.

The section of the history that, according to M. Lavisse's arrangement follows M. de la Blache's *Tableau Géographique* was, it will be remembered, the first portion of the work that was published. In it M. Bloch's elaborate account of Roman Gaul left out the whole history of early Christianity in France. This gap has been very capably supplied by M. Bayet, formerly M. Bloch's colleague at the University of Lyons, in the first chapter of the second volume now under review. But the forty pages thus absorbed in completing the former volume leave less than four hundred available for the whole history of France from the first barbarian settlements down to the accession of Hugh Capet, a period of nearly six hundred years. This is the one place where the admirable proportion generally observed in the series seems conspicuously to seek, and the result is that Merovingian and Carolingian times are dealt with in a fashion too brief and summary to be always satisfactory. The difficulty is made greater by the circumstance that M. Lavisse has here found it necessary to abandon the usual practice of assigning each half-volume to a single hand, and has called upon three writers to collaborate within its limits. M. Bayet, besides the chapter on Romano-Gallic Christianity, writes upon 'the Germans in Gaul,' carrying his story down to the death of Clovis. The same author has also written on 'the church, letters and art,' in the Merovingian period. Other aspects of Merovingian history are assigned to the historian of Robert the Pious, M. C. Pfister, of the Ecole Normale, who also treats of the 'last Carolingians' and 'the origins of the feudal system' in the last two sections of the volume. This apportionment leaves the mass of the book on the Carolingians to Professor Kleinclausz of Dijon. It is characteristic of the too restricted limits of space assigned to all three writers that M. Bayet allows less than two pages to the important problems involved in the British settlements in Armorica, that M. Pfister can only devote a chapter of fifteen pages to a whole century of Merovingian history, that M. Kleinclausz disposes in a little more than a page of the Breton monarchy and ecclesiastical reforms of Nomenoe,

and three pages to the whole ecclesiastical policy of Charlemagne. One advantage flows from this restricted treatment. Some of the still disputable doctrines which M. Kleinclausz emitted in his recent book on *L'Empire Carolingien*[1] are crowded out by sheer lack of space. There is no question of the authenticity of the letter of Louis II to the Emperor Basil when the relations of those two monarchs are altogether left out. We have searched in vain for a name so famous as that of Benedict of Aniane: but the absence of any index or detailed table of contents makes it hard to say whether the exploits of the monastic reformer may not lurk somewhere in the text. Under the circumstances, the writers are to be congratulated on emphasising the main outlines of their tale with so much force and spirit. Yet the best of editing will not make the work of three authors as much of an artistic whole as the book of a single writer.

With the two parts above described M. Lavisse's undertaking is completed from the earliest times to the beginning of the reign of Charles VIII. In the last two half-volumes now before us M. H. Lemonnier carries the story nominally to the death of Henry II, and in fact to the end of the sixteenth century for some aspects of his subject. It is rather a striking thing to an Englishman that the general history of the rivalry of France and Habsburg for Italy, the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation, should have been entrusted by M. Lavisse to the professor of the history of art in the University of Paris and the Beaux-Arts, the editor of Louis Courajod's *Leçons*, and the author of *Les origines de l'art classique en France*. It ensures, at any rate, the artistic and literary side of the work being treated by a specialist of rare competence, whose contributions to these aspects of his study can only be criticised as sometimes going into detailed descriptions of individual works of art on a scale rather too extended for the purpose of these volumes. But we must hasten to add that the Reformation seems to us quite as competently dealt with as the Renaissance: while the ordinary political and military history, if not sketched in a very masterly or interesting fashion, is related with knowledge, intelligence, and sense of proportion. Perhaps it is in dealing with the relations of France to Germany or England or Switzerland, or even Italy, and also in some omissions as regards the bibliography of those sections, that one is most likely to realise that M. Lemonnier's main preoccupation is not 'history' in the old-fashioned sense of Ranke and Stubbs. The indications of this, though fairly numerous, are not of sufficient moment to be set down here.

M. Lemonnier, however, shows an utter disregard not only for chronology, but for his readers' convenience, in the arrangement of his matter. In V. i. M. Lemonnier begins, after the fashion of earlier volumes, with a succinct political history of the period 1492 to 1518 in a section labelled 'Les guerres d'Italie.' It is followed equally correctly by a book on the internal history of the same period, including a chapter on 'Les débuts de la Renaissance.' Then, for the rest of the half-volume, M. Lemonnier treats of the internal history, the 'social, intellectual, and religious evolution' of the whole reign of Francis I. It is hard to see how the average reader can take all this in, when he has not previously

[1] See *English Historical Review*, xviii. 344-6.

been informed of the political history of the period 1518 to 1547. The relations between political and intellectual history were never closer than in the age of the Reformation, and, as a matter of fact, M. Lemonnier has constantly to assume a knowledge of what he first published some months later in his second half-volume. Even when such knowledge is not necessary for comprehension, there are grave inconveniences in (*e.g.*) telling of Bourbon's revolt so far as it concerns France in one book, and so far as it concerns Charles V and Italy in another. Moreover V. ii. does not much mend matters. Though the earlier part of it only carries political history to the treaty of Le Cateau-Cambrésis, in the final and most excellent concluding portion dealing with 'la formation de l'esprit classique en France,' M. Lemonnier is forced, when treating of Montaigne and Goujon, Philibert de l'Orme and Cousin, Du Bellay, Ronsard, and the lesser stars of the Pléiade, to presuppose a general acquaintance with the reigns of the last three Valois kings. Things are made worse by the want of index and tables of contents, and still worse by some indications of carelessness in putting together the political chapters. Thus we are brought quite accidentally into contact with Clement VII, whose election is assumed, and whose family policy first comes in incidentally in such a fashion that only those who know him to be a Medici can be sure of it. The French general reader must be very much better informed than the English if such historical summersaults are permissible over the Channel. And even if they be, the method lends itself to a tendency towards detached essay writing rather than co-ordinated history, which is the bane of all joint-stock historical productions. From such faults M. Lavisse's collaborators have been as a rule so exempt that we may be permitted a complaint that some of them possess the defects of their qualities so long as we recognise at the same time the general high level of their work. It is, unluckily, not yet possible to write a general history of England for 'le grand public' in which such a broad view of history, as that which M. Lavisse takes, can be effectively upheld. And we must, it is to be feared, wait some time before we can find an English professor of geography able to prepare the way for our own history after the fashion of M. de la Blache, or an English professor of the history of art who is able to deal adequately with every aspect of the spacious days of the English Renaissance.

T. F. Tout.

Alcuin: his Life and his Work. By C. J. B. Gaskoin. (London: Clay. 1904.)

The introductory chapters of this book, describing the schools of Wales, Ireland, and England, have the appearance of an afterthought, and give little or no information which is not to be found in standard works. Mr. Gaskoin is much more at home in dealing with the biography and literary work of Alcuin. His estimate of Alcuin's place in the history of thought is moderate and judicious. He has a due amount of sympathy for his hero's point of view, and at the same time acknowledges with perfect frankness the limitations of Alcuin's work and character. The sketch of Alcuin's theological position in chapter viii. may be specially commended for its accurate account of the Adoptionist contro-

versy, the most important in which Alcuin was concerned; and although Mr. Gaskoin modestly disclaims the right to an independent opinion on the questions of liturgical and biblical criticism which he discusses in chapter x., he has provided a useful *résumé* of modern researches on such topics as that of the Alcuinian text of the Vulgate. That he should have little new to say about the scholastic work of Alcuin is only natural. The subject is one which has been admirably discussed by the scholars of three nations. But in chapter ix. we have a careful account of the part which Alcuin bore in his master's work of educational reform.

The biographical chapters would be more readable if they were less compressed. But their shortness is not due to insufficient mastery of the material. Mr. Gaskoin shows a thorough knowledge of Alcuin's writings and their modern critics; and in dealing with the correspondence he has a number of independent suggestions to offer with regard to the chronological sequence of the letters which he uses. Among his more important modifications of accepted views we may notice the date of 799 which he assigns to the Synod of Aachen, commonly placed in the year 800. It is difficult to conceive that Charles had leisure to consider the heresies of Felix of Urgel in the latter year, and Alcuin's letters relating to the synod contain nothing inconsistent with the earlier date. But the general tendency of Mr. Gaskoin's narrative calls for more remark than his detail. He regards Alcuin as a scholar pure and simple, and can find no evidence of his interference on any considerable scale in political affairs. Even in the years 799 and 800 he believes Alcuin to have been no more than a passive and often ill-informed spectator of the events which culminated in the imperial coronation of his master. This conclusion has been independently defended by Ohr in a recent monograph on the coronation,[1] and we believe that it is substantially right. But the opposite view has been ably defended by Kleinclausz,[2] and calls for a fuller investigation than Mr. Gaskoin has seen fit to give it. He takes no notice of the distich prefixed to a letter addressed by Alcuin to Charles in March 799 before Leo's flight from Rome:—

> Det tibi perpetuam clemens in saecla salutem
> *Et decus imperii*, David amate, Deus.[3]

This cannot be interpreted as anything but a prayer for the elevation of Charles to the empire. The couplet was written before any definite plans for bringing this result to pass can well have been framed. But it is thoroughly in keeping with the tone of the court poetry of the time, and it is hard to doubt that it expresses the hopes of those Franks who afterwards arranged the imperial coronation.

Nor can it be argued that Alcuin's opinion on such matters counted for nothing with his master. The abbot's well-known letter to his master on the subject of Leo's restoration was at once followed by an invitation to go with Charles to Rome.[4] It is unlikely that Charles would have responded in this way to advice which he resented or considered beneath

[1] *Die Kaiserkrönung Karls des Grossen*, Tübingen, 1904.
[2] *L'Empire Carolingien*, Paris, 1902.
[3] *Alcuin.* Ep. 170, ed. Dümmler. [4] Ep. 177.

his attention. True that Alcuin took no part in the conference of Charles and Leo at Paderborn, which followed immediately afterwards. This, however, is sufficiently explained by the ill-health which had already compelled the old scholar to decline the invitation for the Roman journey; and although Alcuin was not immediately informed of what passed at the conference, we need not suppose that he was permanently left in ignorance. Charles assented to a proposal that Alcuin should be asked to act as Leo's secretary in preparing the papal case; the king's reluctance to press that office on Alcuin is to be explained by the difference in their views about the proper means of rehabilitating Leo's character.[5] But radical as this difference was, it did not destroy the friendship of the king for his old teacher, nor make Alcuin's advice on the general situation less valuable. The visit which Charles made to Tours in the early part of 800 was undertaken, so Alcuin's biographer asserts, with the object of consulting the abbot. There were other questions than that of Rome in which both men were interested; but if we follow Mr. Gaskoin in transferring the Synod of Aachen to the previous year, there was no question so likely to be uppermost in the minds of both as that of the future protection of the papacy. This, in outline, is the case which might be stated against Mr. Gaskoin's view. Alcuin was a trusted counsellor in matters of ecclesiastical policy. There is reason to think that his views on the crisis of 799–800 were heard and weighed by his master; the idea of a Frankish empire had passed through his mind. On the other hand, it can be shown that the departure of Charles for Rome left Alcuin in complete uncertainty as to what would happen there. He did not know how the pope would fare. He did not expect that the coronation would take place on Christmas Day; for after the New Year, when he has occasion to write to Charles, he still addresses him as *David rex*. It would be strange if he had even a general suspicion that the Roman visit would sooner or later result in the assumption of the imperial title; for his confidential correspondence with Arno of Salzburg at this time does not contain the slightest reference to any such idea. H. W. C. Davis.

Il Chronicon Farfense di Gregorio di Catino. Precedono la Constructio Farfensis e gli Scritti di Ugo di Farfa. A cura di Ugo Balzani. (*Fonti per la Storia d' Italia.* Scrittori: Secoli ix–xii). Two volumes. (Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano. 1903.)

Although none of the texts in these volumes is published for the first time, the necessity of a new edition is fully justified. No one, and least of all Count Balzani, would depreciate the immense services of Muratori; but merely to re-edit Muratori will not serve the needs of modern students. Even the prestige of the *Monumenta Germaniae* in its splendid range of folio volumes has not been able to stand against the demand for books more convenient to handle and more easy to buy. Its future issues are to appear in quarto; the existing quarto series is broken up into a number of distinct sections; and many of the works contained either in the folio or the quarto series have been republished in a separate form in octavo. The attempt to comprise all the histories of a given

[5] Ep. 179.

country in a single numbered set of volumes belongs, we are persuaded, to a past age. Such a series is not only beyond the means of the private purchaser, but it necessarily requires supplements. What is wanted is to edit each history or group of histories by itself, and above all to allow the books to be obtained separately. In the case of the Farfa chronicles there are special reasons for a new edition and for the inclusion in it of the works of several authors. In the first place both the *Destructio Farfensis* and the *Chronicon* were printed by Muratori from modern transcripts, while of the *Chronicon* the actual autograph exists, though Muratori was not permitted to make use of it. Secondly, the anonymous *Constructio* and the *Destructio* of Abbat Hugh, with its connected pieces, form an inseparable introduction to the *Chronicon* of Gregory of Catino. Thirdly, the *Chronicon* is written throughout with an eye for the territorial possessions of the monastery of Farfa; and it is only since the chartulary of the house has been published that it is possible to edit and illustrate properly the numerous documents inserted in the *Chronicon*.

Count Balzani devotes an interesting section of his preface to the life and writings of Gregory of Catino. Born about 1060, he devoted himself from 1092 onwards to the task of collecting and arranging all the materials he could find for the history of his monastery. His largest work is the chartulary or *Regesto*, famous as one of the two earliest works of its kind outside Germany now in existence, the other being the chartulary of Subiaco.[1] The Farfa book was edited by Count Balzani and Signor Giorgi for the Società Romana di Storia Patria in four volumes between 1879 and 1892.[2] After he had finished the *Regesto*, which comprised the evidences of the property of the monastery, Gregory proceeded to transcribe the documents relative to the lands which it had granted out. This he did in his *Liber Largitorius*, of which considerable use has been made in the present edition. Thirdly, he composed the *Chronicon Farfense*, now for the first time published from the original manuscript, which was in large part written by the author's own hand. Lastly, when he was about seventy years of age, he drew up, under the title of *Liber Floriger Chartarum Coenobii Farfensis*, an index to the chief documents contained in his other works, arranged under places. This, like the *Largitorius*, remains unpublished. Another composition, the *Orthodoxa Defensio imperialis*, which has been attributed to him and is printed under his name in the *Monumenta Germaniae* (*Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et Pontificum*, ii.), Count Balzani considers to be more probably the work of an imitator, perhaps a pupil, of Gregory than of Gregory himself (pref. pp. xxxiv, xxxv). Thanks to his intimate acquaintance with Gregory's *Regesto*, as well as with his other documentary collections, the editor has been able to annotate the

[1] *Il Regesto Sublacense*, published by L. Allodi and G. Levi for the Società Romana di Storia Patria in 1885. The two English chartularies of Worcester and Rochester (*Hemingi Chartularium* and *Textus Roffensis*, both edited by Thomas Hearne, in 1723 and 1720) are only separated from these by a narrow margin of years.

[2] Three volumes were noticed in this Review, vol. v. pp. 581–5 (1890). The last was reserved until the promised volume containing the introduction and indexes should appear. Unfortunately its publication is still delayed.

Chronicle from the local point of view in a manner which deserves our hearty gratitude. For the general history of the times with which it deals the Chronicle, as is known, does not possess great independent value, except in its latest portion, which is already accessible in the *Monumenta Germaniae*. Its sources are sufficiently indicated in the footnotes. The editor in his preface (p. xxxi) calls attention to a fragment of an abbreviation of the lives of the popes, preserved in Gregory's own hand in the Biblioteca Casanatense, which is yet another testimony to the monk's indefatigable industry. While the varieties of handwriting in the Chronicle and its documentary sources have been admirably explored by the editor, we regret that no indication has been given of the plan, if plan it can be called, upon which its contents were put together. Dates are indeed given, sometimes in the margin, sometimes in the notes; but we want some sort of tabular conspectus to enable us to find our way through the chronicler's innumerable disgressions. To give an instance, the account of the twenty-second abbat, Peter, early in the tenth century, is broken off at vol. i. p. 234. Then follow an account of the general history of his time, a list of lands lost by the monastery, and an enumeration of grants to it omitted in their proper place, going down far into the eleventh century. In the midst of this, on p. 289, we find a brief notice of the triple abbacy of Adam, Hildebrand, and Campo, which belongs to about 953. The history of Abbat Peter is not resumed until p. 300. Even a numbered series of sections would have been some help.

Prefixed to the chronicle are the *Constructio* and the works of Abbat Hugh. The *Constructio* exists merely in a set of lections found in a Farfa book of the eleventh century. Count Balzani follows Signor Giorgi in regarding the text as incomplete, but whether it forms a conflation of a Farfa and a Volturno legend, or whether the Volturno account was inserted in his narrative by the Farfa writer, he leaves doubtful. Abbat Hugh's *Destructio*, familiar to many readers from the striking summary of it in Giesebrecht's *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, to which reference might have been made, is preserved in no copy earlier than the sixteenth century. It is to be regretted that Count Balzani has omitted the numbers of the chapters given in Bethmann's edition (*M. G. H.* xi.), and thus placed an unnecessary difficulty in the way of any one who wishes to verify references to the *Destructio* in works published heretofore. Hugh's three smaller tracts are included in Gregory's compilations, and the two of them which come from his Chronicle appear in this edition, with most of the footnotes, twice over (i. 55–70,[3] ii. 75–86); the third is taken from the *Regesto*. The annotation of Hugh's works leaves something to be desired. On p. 42 we miss a reference to Liudprand's *Antapodosis*, v. 5–8, which, however, is duly given in the parallel place of Gregory's chronicle, i. 333, n. 2. Much help is given by citations of Gregory's other works, but for the rest the notes are almost all confined to points of chronology, and these the editor rarely settles. We fully admit that the chronology of the earlier abbats of Farfa is extremely obscure, but we think that a resolute attempt to collect and sift all the

[3] The references to the folios of the manuscript in the margins of these pages are throughout incorrectly given.

data in a special excursus would have produced a more satisfactory result than the series of undecided notes which we find here. The suggestion on p. 33 (and in Gregory's chronicle, p. 301) that *non* should be supplied in the account of Rimo's appointment to the abbacy, *quamvis in canonicatu ordine esset quando hoc recepit*, appears to us more than doubtful. Count Balzani thinks the election was uncanonical because Rimo was nominated by his predecessor; but the objection as stated is not that he was uncanonically elected, but that he was *in canonicatu ordine* (or, as Gregory puts it, *in canonico ordine*): he was a canon and not a monk. On p. 39 the emendation *quod* for *qui* is almost certainly right: Hugh was personally acquainted with Odilo of Cluny and could not have spoken of Odo as still living. The mention of Odo raises a curious question. Gregory goes over the same ground in his Chronicle, but in the two places where one would have expected him to refer to the activity of the Cluniac abbat in reforming the monasteries round Rome (i. 307, 324) he omits all allusion to his name.

The book, like all the publications of the Istituto Storico Italiano, is beautifully printed; and a most ample index, the work of Cavaliere E. Bianco, is supplied. REGINALD L. POOLE.

Aemter und Zünfte: zur Entstehung des Zunftwesens. Von Dr. F. KEUTGEN. (Jena: Fischer. 1903.)

ALTHOUGH in part polemical and concerned with a controversy that has not raged in England, this book is of the first value to students of the early history of our own commercial organisation. Following up his attack on the school of historians who saw in the town which was a bishop's see the typical ancient German borough, and were thus led to ascribe the existence of the borough-court to the ecclesiastical immunist, Dr. Keutgen now gives battle to the economic wing of the same school, the historians who ascribe the origin of gilds to the seignorial power. In spite of all that Dr. von Below has written the *hofrechtliche Theorie* has been gaining new allies; and the fact that Eberstadt's *Ursprung des Zunftwesens* has had some weight with the learned author of the *Deutsche Wirthschaftsgeschichte*, Von Inama-Sternegg, has induced Dr. Keutgen again to go over the ground of contention. The controversy cannot be regretted that has led him to the present minute and penetrating analysis of the texts, whose whole range and import are probably known to him as they are to few, and that by reason of the arduous labour undergone in preparation for his *Urkunden zur städtischen Verfassungsgeschichte*. The first hundred pages of his new book are devoted to a demonstration of the baselessness of the theory that sees in the lords the makers of gilds, but Dr. Keutgen takes his principal joy not in the exposure of error but in the discovery of truth, and whether in the pursuit of his own or other people's speculations he never wanders far from the facts.

Here in England we are so lamentably short of texts descriptive of the organisation of the early English artisans that there has been a judicious avoidance of dogmatism. Professor Ashley has inclined to the view 'that some of the craft gilds of France and Germany were originally organisations of artisan serfs,' and thinks it may have been the case also in some

places in England,' 'but no evidence has yet been adduced to show that it was so.' In England more could be done than has been done to collect the evidences of early English trade and handicraft, to display the variety of skilled professions known to Englishmen before the Conquest. But even on the estates of the largest monasteries, where there were undoubtedly groups of handicraftsmen, we may question whether any gild-like organisation would be discovered as the reward of further inquiry. That in many crafts helpers were needed, who were likely to be in a subordinate position to the 'masters' of the craft, is certain; many trades could not be carried on by an individual without help; but the existence of *magistri artium* no more points to an organisation of the masters of a single craft than the presence of a master butler in the lord's household points to the existence of a gild of butlers. To the supporters of the *hofrechtliche Theorie* the words *Amt*, *officium*, *ministerium*, *magisterium* in their early uses all indicate organisation in gild-like union under a master, and the organising power that thus groups the artisans is assumed to be the lord's. When the needs of his household have been fully satisfied, the servile craftsmen are supposed to have had leave to dispose of their handiwork to their own advantage; their free labour made them able to secure independence, and when independent they made effective use through their autonomous gilds of the power of union which they had been taught in servitude. Text after text that might be taken to point to gild-like unions on the early monastic or rural estates is quoted by Dr. Keutgen and the baselessness of the interpretation demonstrated.

For the true origin of trade gilds he would look entirely to the market and the borough, to merchant law and borough law. He would leave less to the Germanic 'associative impulse' than some of his colleagues have allowed. He feels that there has been a weak place here which the opposing school have been quick to seize, and points out that the Strassburg *Aemter* could not possibly be ascribed to a free impulse to union in fellowships. He sees the supposedly 'servile' handicraftsmen as *mercatores*, persons who work for market, who have a law of their own, merchant law, which protects their persons and their goods, wherever they may be, men who, whatever their personal dependence upon their lords, are economically independent. The early texts that tell of the *ius negotiale* are not as numerous as could be wished, but they are sufficient to prove the antiquity of merchant law. The manor in Dr. Keutgen's view was not that completely self-sufficing unit which is sometimes set before us; many lords found it needful to make some of their men *mercatores*, in order to supply home needs. A man could not gradually come to be a *mercator* any more than a village could gradually come to have a market; he was made *mercator* in virtue of a legal act. For instance, in 1075 Abbot Eckehard conceded to Allensbach *omnibus eiusdem oppidi villanis mercandi potestatem, ut ipsi et eorum posteri sint mercatores, exceptis his qui in exercendis vineis vel agris occupantur.* The *mercatores* were no 'homeless traders who travelled in caravans,' in a continually migratory condition. In England we very much need a fuller recognition for this class of market workers, a class scarcely less important than the burgess class, and a fuller study of the early market law, which gave us our 'law merchant.'

In respect of their weights and measures the rural community, the market, and the borough are carefully analysed and differentiated by Dr. Keutgen, and he points out that the 'equal' measures ordered by the capitularies did not mean that local measures should cease to be, but that the same measure must be used for selling as for buying, for giving as for receiving. There may be a custom requiring the bushel of the corn-render to the lord to be 'heaped,' and the bushel of the seed-render from the lord to be 'razed,' but to use a different bushel for the two purposes is that 'falseness' of measure which the law forbids. The inspection of measures is not the work of public officials directly, but of communal officers who have a responsibility to the state. Out of their duty of inspection comes their jurisdiction over measures. Out of the market control, and in particular borough market control, of measures, prices, workmanship, matters of direct interest to the welfare of the market, comes organisation of trade. The grouping of trades in their 'rows,' in their specialised street markets, might be as much an arrangement of the communal or burghal authorities as the result of a free impulse of association. *Aemter* resulted from the ordering of markets, whether the market-place were the lord's land or not. The trades had their three *ungebotene Dinge* in the year, and these assemblies were important opportunities for the development of gild autonomy. Held at first under the officers of the borough in control of the market, the craftsmen sought the right to choose their own *Amtsmeister*, that they might be quit of the chicanery of the 'foreign' official. These are some of the things which Dr. Keutgen sets forth, not in general terms, but from the evidence of the texts. The English evidence, where there is any, points to the same thing: the gilds can be seen here, paying for leave to have self-government, as the borough paid to be quit of the sheriff. The act of payment in both cases may be one of the first conscious acts that witness to and strengthen the associative impulse. The 'lot' in the common bargain, the law which allowed every merchant present at the making of a bargain to claim a share, should also not be overlooked as an element in the making of trade gilds.

We are directed to the borough rather than the rural market in search of the early organisation of skilled handicraft. The rural market, being concerned only with a few dealers, regarded the wares merely as vendible commodities, and was not capable of laying down rules as to how they should be produced. The borough, with its large resident population, could divide the denizen from the foreign elements, make severer rules for the control of the market and of the wares, and regulate the processes of production by inspecting the permanent stalls and work-places. Soon the market found that it had a reputation to keep up which was a profitable asset: then none were admitted to the market but those who were skilled in their trades; and the cloth, stamped with the borough mark, must be made in a particular way, in pieces of fixed size, that wholesale traders, knowing what they buy, might be encouraged to buy. The lord of a manor had none of that personal interest in the handicraft of his tenants which impels to all this elaborate control. Dr. Keutgen points this out, but it might perhaps be added that there were some fines for breaches of trade laws in which he took a strong interest.

In England his assizes of bread and beer, or of victual, point to the existence of rules, though these may well be customs in whose maintenance the tenants themselves had an interest.

Dr. Keutgen does not stop at the point where gilds can first be dimly seen, but analyses the shades of difference between *Amt*, *Zunft*, *Gilde*, *Innung*, *Brüderschaft*, and then in bold outlines points out how, where the principles of self-government were wrongly applied, the gilds went the way to destruction. The book is suggestive and stimulating in many ways, but its speculations never outrun its learning. MARY BATESON.

Early Yorkshire Schools. Vol. II. Pontefract, Howden, Northallerton, Acaster, Rotherham, Giggleswick, Sedbergh. By ARTHUR FRANCIS LEACH. (Yorkshire Archæological Society, Record Series. Vol. XXXIII., for the year 1903.)

IN this second volume of researches into the history of early Yorkshire schools Mr. Leach has been able to support his well-known thesis of the 'antiquity and ubiquity of secondary education in centuries long anterior to its hitherto reputed beginnings.' Mr. Leach places the origin of Pontefract as far back as 1100; Howden, about 1265; Acaster, about 1470; Rotherham, 1480. The grammar school at Northallerton Mr. Leach dates back to 1322, Giggleswick to 1507, and Sedbergh to 1527. Mr. Leach thus makes good his case that these schools are not to have their origin identified with the foundations (if such there be) of Edward VI. The first volume on *Early Yorkshire Schools* included the account of still earlier schools, viz. York, Beverley, and Ripon. It is a pity Mr. Leach does not leave the interesting statement of educational facts to count for what they are worth; for they are worth a great deal. By claiming the 'antiquity and ubiquity of secondary education in centuries long anterior to its hitherto reputed beginnings,' there arises in the reader's mind the suggestion that it is necessary to wait for further proof than even two volumes on *Early Yorkshire Schools*, including some half-score or dozen remarkable examples of early schools, before committing oneself to so strong a term as the 'ubiquity' of secondary education in those earlier times. The accumulation of documentary evidence such as this of Mr. Leach is of the highest value. What we want is still more of the material for English educational history. We may then come to Mr. Leach's conclusions, or we may have to accept them in some modified form, as determined by the additional weight of further and wider investigations in connexion with other schools in other parts of the country. That there was a more general education in the times before the Reformation than afterwards was supposed to have existed every one must admit. Richard Mulcaster, in his *Positions*, published in 1581, says there is 'great reason why order should be taken to *restrain the number* that will needs to the book.' And he gives the 'great reason:'

> While the church was an harbour for all men to ride in, which knew any letter, *those needed no restraint, the livings there were infinite and capable of that number*, the more drew that way, and found relief that way, the better for that state, which encroached still on, and by *clasping all persons*, would have grasped all livings. The state is now altered, that book maintenance maimed,

the preferment that way hath turned a new leaf. And will ye let the fry increase, when the feeding fails?

Mulcaster's view is important, because he is so comparatively near to the time of the Reformation, and his view clearly appears to be that formerly secondary education was more extensive before the Reformation than after. But the question arises, How extensive was it in fact? The more details we get from such documents as those which we gratefully receive from Mr. Leach's research the more exactly founded will be our view on the matter. But it hinders rather than helps when we are told vaguely, in Mr. Leach's treatise preceding the documents, of the 'ubiquity' of schools.

The schools in the list given above as to which Mr. Leach submits the most considerable documentary materials are Pontefract, Rotherham, and Sedbergh. The Pontefract school, he shows, originated in a foundation for the Hospital of St. Nicholas, but he points out that it does not, unfortunately, appear how many poor secular clerks were to be thus provided for. In a warrant of the commissioners under the Chantries Act of 1548 the incumbent of the chantry of Corpus Christi is described as 'put in' by the mayor and his brethren to say 'morrow mass.' This, Mr. Leach explains, was 5 o'clock mass, and such an incumbent was willing sometimes to undertake further work, such as acting as highway surveyor, 'while he not unfrequently eked out his time by teaching the early rising schoolboy, and so not a few grammar schools owe their origin to the morrow mass.' It would be interesting to have some other examples. Mr. Leach gives us the foundation of the Rotherham school, which was the main part of the provision of a college, or, as Mr. Leach puts it, a small, a very small Winchester or Eton. The college was to consist of a provost, a preacher of God's word, three fellows, teachers of grammar, song, and the art of writing, and six boys. The provost, Mr. Leach remarks, is paid 10*l.* a year, the same sum as the head masters of Winchester and Eton. The provision appears to have been originally for six children on the foundation, but the grammar master had to teach all those sent to him by the provost, and the song master to teach every one coming from all parts of England, with preference for the diocese and province of York. An account is given of Thomas Rotherham's library as given by him by will to Rotherham College. Sedbergh Grammar School was founded by Roger Lupton, a lawyer cleric, between 1523 and 1525. After his power it was founded, says Mr. Leach, as a smaller Eton and King's, being connected by the founder's scholarships with St. John's College, Cambridge. Readers of Mr. Leach's treatise introductory to the documents will be glad to have the accounts of the two school-founders, Thomas Rotherham and Roger Lupton. Mr. Leach's descriptions of Northallerton School and Sedbergh School under the Commonwealth open up the important question of the state of the schools under the Commonwealth. Northallerton had during the Commonwealth a schoolmaster called Smelt, and there were seldom less than eighty boys in the school of this small town, whom he taught without any assistance.

Mr. Leach gives his views as to the public schools and grammar schools, regretting the distinction which has grown up in the use of these terms—one, he says, with 'no foundation in history, law, or any-

thing but snobbery.' 'The country gentleman,' he says, 'resorted to Chichester Prebendal School, or Sedbergh, or Warwick, or Stratford, just as much as to Harrow or Rugby.' Godwin in his *History of the Commonwealth* showed the interest of Cromwell's government in education. But the government would seem to have had, I am inclined to think, a special interest in Winchester. In a manuscript of the British Museum it appears that the educationist John Dury had been sent to Winchester 'to reform that place.' In the Sloane MS. 649, p. 54, dated 4 and 7 May 1646, are the heads of matters to be thought on concerning the education of nobles and gentlemen. It is an interesting speculation whether these 'heads' were given as lectures to the Winchester College authorities. But the fact that Dury was sent to Winchester 'to reform that place' suggests a more than ordinary interest in that particular 'grammar' school. Mr. Leach maintains that Eton School is the grammar school of the College of St. Mary of Eton, 'just as Rotherham was the grammar school of the College of Jesus of Rotherham, or Sedbergh the grammar school of the chantry of Roger Lupton of Sedbergh.' This view may perhaps be compared with that of Edward Leigh in his *Foelix Consortium* (1663), in which he says, 'There are in England many trivial schools in towns and cities; amongst the most famous are Eton, Westminster, and Winchester.' Leigh, however, adds in a note that Westminster, with forty scholars, sends as many yearly to both the universities as Eton and Winchester both, though they have each of them seventy scholars. This seems to confirm one of Mr. Leach's contentions that the importance of a school largely consisted in the man who was at the head rather than any particular *status*; for when Leigh praises Westminster at the expense of Eton and Winchester combined it was the redoubtable Richard Busby who was the head master. The 'many trivial schools' in England, of which Eton, Westminster, and Winchester were 'amongst the most famous,' is substantially the same as the 'grammar' schools.

It is not possible in the space of a review to follow up all the suggestive questions which Mr. Leach raises, and which would further arise from a close exposition of the documents he has brought forward. But there is certain material to which Mr. Leach himself refers with admiration, and the introduction of this material for the history of schools would alone constitute a title to attention to the book from all who are interested in the history of teaching. I refer to the section in the documents concerning Rotherham Grammar School headed 'Rotherham School Curriculum about 1630,' and the further extracts in 1636. These extracts are taken from Charles Hoole's *New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School*. Mr. Leach says 'it gives a complete picture of an ordinary English grammar school in the time of the Civil War or immediately after.' I hardly think we can say an 'ordinary' school. Hoole had been under Robert Doughty at Wakefield School, a schoolmaster who taught for fifty years and had, as Mr. Leach quotes, 'as many and those as well approved schoolmasters his quondam scholars as any one man in England.' From a grounding by such a man, as well as by his own varied experience and enthusiasm for schoolmastering, probably Hoole's statement of what he expected a scholar to acquire in his school represented a standard far higher than the average. I agree with Mr. Leach when

he says that the school curriculum laid down is an 'amazing picture.' But it is surely going too far to conclude 'we are bound to believe that, published as an actual course of study by a practical schoolmaster, it was not only possible but actual.' It may be an ideal curriculum, grounded upon suggestions from actual and very varied experience. The *New Discovery* is a remarkable book. As Mr. Leach says, 'the amazing and interesting parts of Hoole's book are, first, the marvellous lists of school books he gives, which, he says, should be in every school library; and secondly, the extraordinary amount the boys were to assimilate, and the extraordinarily early age at which they were expected to do so without any trouble.' This is the impression the book gives, but it gives more. It makes a reader realise that the aims of masters like Hoole were to give a real and high mental discipline, for which there are very adequate materials and resources of instruction. These old methods of instruction are likely to be underrated in our time, because they have not been considered in detail.

Mr. Leach's introductory sketch consists of eighty-seven pages. His documents occupy 439 pages. There is an excellent and valuable index. It is a book which has involved steady, self-sacrificing labour, of the sort that is apt to bring comparatively slight credit to the author, whilst it eases enormously the work of those who come to traverse the wider tracts of general educational history. I recall the words of Mr. Leach which I quoted in reviewing vol. i.

> I would venture (he says) to appeal to owners or custodians of ancient documents to search them, or have them searched, or give facilities for search by competent persons, for references to the school, or a schoolmaster, or scholars, to payments for teaching or repair of school buildings, especially before the reign of Edward VI. . . . It is only by the accretion of a large number of scattered facts and references, in themselves perhaps of no great interest or moment, that the lost history of English schools can be recovered.

This is the spirit which carries within it the possibility of a history of school education in England. Mr. Leach has not only stated it. He has himself given important illustrations of how such salvage can be collected, and if he seems, as he does to me, sometimes to have too keen a readiness to press *a priori* views, yet the presentation of his documentary material leaves the student free to gather impressions for himself, whilst few, if any, can fail to be grateful for his guidance in the exposition of the documents as he illuminates them, with instances and criticisms gathered from his wide experience in other researches.

FOSTER WATSON.

Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199), éditée pour la première fois et traduite en français, par J. B. CHABOT. Tomes I, II. (Paris: Leroux. 1899–1904.)

THE vast work of Michael the Syrian was, fifteen years ago, known only in a short and corrupt Armenian epitome. A complete Arabic version was, however, obtained by the British Museum in 1890, and part of this also exists in a Vatican MS.; while a few years later the original Syriac was discovered by Archbishop Rahmani, and is now being edited, with

translation and commentary, by M. Chabot. Of this great undertaking the first two volumes, containing two and three fascicules respectively, have now appeared, bringing the history down to the year 776. Of these, the first three fascicules contain matter drawn from known or legendary sources and are therefore of little historical value. The fourth fascicule comes down to about 580, and in it the author draws largely from John of Ephesos; but, since the contents of the lost second part of John's work were already in great measure known to us from various sources, the gain in historical knowledge is not as great as might be expected. It is therefore with the fifth fascicule, in which the author deals with the obscure history of the seventh and eighth centuries, that the real historical importance of the publication begins. Not only does Michael give us a minute history of the Jacobite church, in which many original documents are preserved, but his work also throws considerable light upon the sources for Byzantine history. The series of literary historians, existing whole or in fragments, which begins with Eunapius, ends with Theophylact Simokatta; and from 603, where his work ends, to about 780, where Theophanes becomes an original source, we have no contemporary Byzantine historian properly so called and are obliged to depend almost entirely upon Theophanes and Nikephoros, who wrote at the beginning of the ninth century. All research must therefore begin by an attempt to determine the character of the sources used by these writers, upon which they give no information whatever; and in this the text of Michael, with the regular references to Theophanes in M. Chabot's notes, will be of much greater assistance than the Armenian version or the epitome of Barhebraeus. That Theophanes uses a Western source which was used by Nikephoros and an Eastern source which was not used by Nikephoros is obvious; but, as Theophanes is much the fuller of the two writers, it does not follow that everything that is not in Nikephoros comes from the Eastern source; nor is the absence of the Byzantine method of dating by indictions a conclusive test. When, however, we find a narrative given by Theophanes occurring in the same shape in Michael, its Eastern origin is evident. Hence, to take two instances only, we know from Michael that the comparison of Constantine Pogonatus and his brothers to the Trinity and the story of the manner in which Justinian II sent to fetch his wife from the Chazars come from the Eastern source: while the value of this source where it deals with Western affairs may be inferred from the cases in which we have the two narratives side by side, as in the account of the rebellion of Apsimar, where Michael's story (p. 473)[1] is wholly fictitious. As it is not likely that Theophanes could read Syriac, or that a Syriac writer would be translated into Greek, it must be presumed that the Eastern author wrote in Greek and was therefore a Melchite; but the questions when and where he wrote, and what the character of his work was, had better be deferred till the appearance of M. Chabot's next fascicule. But whatever answer to these questions may be found, it will henceforth be impossible to write the history of this period without reference to Michael, or to treat all the statements of Theophanes as of equal authority.

Of the manner in which M. Chabot has performed his laborious task

[1] The references are to the translation.

it would be hard to speak too highly. Errors and omissions of course there are; but, considering the immensity of the work and the short time in which it has been done, it is matter for astonishment that there are so few. For criticisms of the translation this is not the place; but I may remark that p. 431, l. 8, seems to require a note, since Euchaita is nowhere near Cilicia, and that at p. 479, l. 2, it should have been clearly explained that Toranda is only a conjecture (no doubt a correct one), the text having 'Tibranda.' Again, the name 'Gargarun,' which follows this, is surely Gangra,[2] the statement in the translation that it was in Cilicia being, as M. Chabot explains, taken from the Armenian, and having no resemblance to the Syriac text. That Gangra was taken by Marwan, not by Maslama, is hardly an objection.

The remaining volumes will no doubt be of great value for Eastern affairs, especially ecclesiastical; but they are not likely to have the same importance for Byzantine history as the part which has just been published.

E. W. Brooks.

Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Arranged and edited by Francis A. Gasquet. Vol. I. (London: Royal Historical Society. Camden Series, 1904.)

The Abbot-president of the English Benedictines has augmented the debt in which historical students already stand bound to him. He has added to the long series of the old Camden Society and its successor a volume which may be said to open a new window through which we may regard the monastic system of the middle ages. It is not difficult even for the lay reader to penetrate the walls of a single monastery, St. Edmund's or St. Alban's, but here we are admitted into the secrets of an entire province of a great order.

The two volumes of Bishop Redman's book of letters and precedents, which constitute this collection, have had widely different fates. One was transcribed by Francis Peck, who methodised the documents which it contained, and is now lost. The other survives among the Ashmole MSS. at the Bodleian. Abbot Gasquet has reunited the two halves of the register, and prints the whole series according to the system adopted by Peck in his transcript. This was certainly a tempting plan, as there seemed to be no object in reconstructing the missing MS. from Peck's transcript, but it involves certain disadvantages of its own. Peck's system was to divide the documents into *Generalia*, arranged in chronological order, and *Specialia*, arranged alphabetically under the names of the houses concerned. The present volume consists of the first part or *Generalia*, but the editor has further subdivided them into six sections; I. Relations between Prémontré and the English Houses; II. Documents relating to Elections; III. Provincial Chapters; IV. Visitations; V. Forms of Letters, Citations, &c.; VI. Miscellaneous. This is no doubt a convenience, though a subject-index in vol. ii. would answer the purpose better; but it unduly separates No. 31 from Nos. 139–141, which came near it in the original register and Peck's transcript, and help to explain some of the allusions in it. In the same way the contention between

[2] See *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xviii. 193, 199.

Abbot Redman and the abbot of Begham, the rival commissaries of the abbot of Prémontré, must be searched for in Nos. 38–40, 78-80, and 144. So also Boniface IX's grant to Easby, which appears to be the beginning of the great 'Rochet' question, is in Section VI., while the various decrees of the chapters provincial dealing with the question are in Section III. There is, no doubt, less difficulty in finding any particular document than in Peck's original plan, but it seems questionable whether the balance of advantage is in favour of the new arrangement.

In the matter of grammar and spelling the text of the volume would have been none the worse for a little more emendation. The editor warns us of the imperfections of Peck's transcript, and a comparison of the documents from the Ashmole Register will show that they are often, though not always, errors of the transcriber. The pious accuracy which reproduces the blunders of the original scribe is certainly a fault on the right side, but the volume would be more agreeable reading if the principles laid down on p. xix of the preface had been drastically carried out. The text would then have gone on all fours, and the oddities of Peck and of the writer of the Ashmole MS. might have been relegated to the footnotes. A few instances will serve to illustrate this. Line 1 of p. 2 should read 'Cum nuper per *vos*,' not 'per *nos*.' P. 4, last line, 'monitioni *pariant*' might have been spelled *pareant*. P. 7, ll. 23, 24, 'et super ipsius intellectu; [ut] universi' might be better emended by changing *et* into *ut*, and leaving out the semicolon. P. 16, ll. 22, 23, should read '*pastoris*,' not '*pastores* more fovere.' Such slips are hardly worth perpetuating in print. Again, p. 22, l. 25, 'asserens *quod* dictos dominos suos,' &c., can be almost certainly read *asserensque*, and the blame for the bad grammar shifted on to Peck's shoulders; and *minime* is a tempting conjecture for *nimirum* on the next page, l. 6 from the end. On p. 57, l. 18, 'securus viarum; *quia* discrimina' . . . should probably be 'securus, viarumque discrimina,' &c. On the other hand, some of the emendations attempted might be improved. *Quendam* for *quemadmodum* on p. 19 is unnecessary; the English was probably 'holding *as it were* a book,' and *cedant* is a more satisfactory reading than *spectant* for the *sedant* on p. 79. So, too, 'qui post mortem *manducavit*' on p. 82 is a quaint periphrasis for 'Christ,' and need not be altered to *manu ducat*. *Liberalem* for *liberales* on p. 102 involves a false concord; *demum* is an easier emendation of *domum* than *Domini* on p. 127, and 'concorditer et *in solidum* parere' seems more natural than the editor's *insolite* for the *insoliti* of the text. It would be tedious to extend this peddling criticism, but it must be urged that a medieval text, if printed at all, should be printed as accurately as possible, having regard to the condition of the manuscripts.

The earlier documents are mainly concerned with the circumstances which led to the compromise between Abbot Adam of Prémontré and the English houses in 1316. These are well discussed in the preface, which reproduces a paper already printed in the Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, and a completely new complexion is put on the story. The letter of the proctors at the Papal Court is very amusing. The mysterious 'Cardinalis Biteiceus,' whom they mention, may possibly be Benedict Fredoli, bishop of Béziers, but the text is clearly

corrupt. A pair of later documents, 35 and 36, is concerned with the devastation of the neighbourhood of Prémontré by war in France, and the consequent necessity of contributions from England. The editor dates these conjecturally as of the year 1354, but the mention of the duke of Orleans, a coming general council, and the holding of a chapter at La Fère seems to fit better with 1408 or thereabouts. The council of Pisa began on Lady-day, 1409, and another Peter was then abbot of Prémontré, from which he seems to have been expelled a few years after. The later documents deal with Bishop Redman's personal activities; but except his dispute with the abbot of Begham and with Prémontré, they are mainly occupied with questions of dress, ritual, and discipline. There seems scarcely enough evidence for the editor's statement that the white canons adopted *black* habits. We hear of black hoods and hats on p. 129, and on p. 152 of black hose, under-garments, and sleeves, black hats and caps (*galeris*) being permitted. The most serious question was as to the right to wear rochets. This practice had been sanctioned at Easby by Boniface IX, but the bull of A.D. 1400 which is known from the papal register does not appear to be the same as that given here.

A few minor points claim attention. The abstract of No. 52 divides the canonical modes of election into 'compromission, inspiration, and postulation,' instead of the more familiar 'quasi-inspiration, compromise, and scrutiny,' but on consulting the document we find 'postulationis' is bracketed. The abbot of Dale's 'household at "Koosters"' on p. 112 is not an unidentified place in Derbyshire, but the 'costers' or hangings surrounding his chamber (*camera*). No. 240 names the Medici bank at Bruges in 1468, possibly the same house which they are known to have occupied in 1479, and which was recently in existence in the Rue des Aiguilles. The reform of music in the English houses in 1489 is mentioned on p. 164, 'spreto prorsus antiquo illo tono ab aliquibus usitato.' This should be of some interest at the present moment.

CHARLES JOHNSON.

La Politica Orientale di Alfonso di Aragona. Per FRANCESCO CERONE. Estratto dall' Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane, XXVII. i.–iv., XXVIII. i. (Naples: Pierro. 1903.)

THE occasion for this volume was afforded by the gift of transcripts from Aragonese documents in the archives of Barcelona to the Società di Storia Patria. They are of interest as illustrating diplomatic and financial aspects of Alfonso's reign, but they scarcely form a sufficient foundation for the superstructure which the author has built upon them in which to enshrine his hero. The scope of the book is the supposed scheme of Alfonso to found a vast lordship on the ruins of the Greek empire, a bulwark of Europe against Asia, an avenue of commerce between the two continents; an immense colony, of which Naples should be the powerful and wealthy metropolis. This offensive aim was, the author continues, diverted by the fall of Constantinople to an almost equally ideal project for the defence of the East through the East—for a combination of the lesser powers of Asia Minor, Greece, and the Islands (Turkish, Greek, Latin, or Albanian) against the Sultan. Such wide conclusions are scarcely supported by the evidence. The author gives 120 pages to

a great North African combination with Egypt, Ethiopia, and Tunis. In the two former cases this reduces itself to a safe-conduct for an Egyptian envoy, who is not known to have utilised it, and the despatch of two missions to Prester John in answer to his request for skilled artisans. Intercourse with Tunis was brisker, as might be expected from old relations and close neighbourhood, but even here the reciprocal embassies are merely concerned with the usual complimentary gifts of horses, lions, and brocades; there is no hint of a political alliance.

Alfonso's claims, whether as king of Aragon or of Naples, upon the Morea and Northern Greece were too fresh and considerable to be entirely waived by a nature so ambitious, but it is to these rather than to decisive action against the Turk that his attention is directed. Yet even this interest was academic. Thus in 1444 he urged his claims to the duchies of Athens and Neopatras, but they were never pressed. From this time onwards there were intermittent negotiations with the despots Demetrius and Thomas with projects for intermarriages. The author prints the text of the treaty of 9 Feb. 1451 between Alfonso and Demetrius, showing that Zurita's abstract of it was essentially correct; but this was directed rather against the emperor than the Turk, and led to no practical results. With Northern Greece and Albania the connexion was a little closer. Scanderbeg acknowledged Alfonso's suzerainty, and the recognition of the house of Tocco in Leucadia and Cephalonia granted by Ladislas was revived. Yet of actual intervention there was no sign. The four galleys promised to the emperor never sailed, nor did the two ships laden with corn which the besieged city bought from Alfonso himself—an interesting example, as the author well points out, of the private trading which made Alfonso's son Ferrante so notorious. After the tragedy Alfonso's measures for defence were equally ineffective. The author, indeed, bases a vast naval combination on the despatch of three galleys to Tenos, while Scanderbeg did actually receive the support of a handful of Neapolitan troops. But such correspondence as there is with Rhodes and Cyprus and Crete, with Morean and Servian despots, with the descendants of Mohammedan emirs and relations of the sultan, is absolutely trivial, though page upon page is devoted to missions in search of falcons under which some deep political scheme is supposed to be concealed. The languor of Alfonso's intervention in the East was due, as the author has frequently to confess, to his absorption in Italian politics, to his inability to spare a man for distant and dangerous enterprise. And these Italian complications in Liguria, in Tuscany and Lombardy, were largely due to Alfonso's acquisitive nature, though the author with some success defends him from Dr. Pastor's charge of deliberately encouraging and prolonging Piccinino's raid, with a view to hampering the pope.

It is difficult to acquit the author of exaggerating the importance of his hero, and the documents, hitherto unpublished, which relate to him. The book is too long for its theme and too discursive. On the other hand, the industry with which illustrative matter has been amassed is most praiseworthy, and the reader will find in the digressions and the notes abundance of interesting information relating to the Oriental powers, and not a little bibliographical assistance. E. Armstrong.

Select Cases before the King's Council in the Star Chamber, commonly called the Court of Star Chamber, 1477–1509. Edited for the Selden Society by I. S. Leadam. (London: Quaritch. 1903.)

This is a big book, and there is so much in it that a reviewer may well feel embarrassed. Mr. Leadam might have earned our gratitude by publishing, even with a very modest preface and annotation, the original documents of these 'Select Cases,' extending as they do, with a small appendix, to 283 pages in quarto; but he has also written a learned introduction of 154 pages, and has appended a threefold index, the first part of authorities cited, the second of subjects, and the third of persons and places, so that the student has every possible facility of turning his labour to account. Yet we have scarcely done justice, even yet, to the very composite character of this work; for the introduction itself is not an undivided whole, but consists of two parts, the first being an elaborate essay on the jurisdiction of the court of the Star Chamber, the second a commentary on the leading cases in the volume.

The history of the jurisdiction of this celebrated court is certainly an obscure subject on which many misconceptions have prevailed. That it was not constituted, as commonly supposed, by an act of Henry VII is abundantly evident; but in what manner it was affected by that act no one certainly would have imagined from the words of the statute itself. The accounts given by Hudson and Coke as to its actual constitution when at work raise difficulties of their own; and the original records here given show that the statutory composition of the court was not in practice adhered to. From the statute it would be supposed that three great officials—'the chancellor and treasurer of England for the time being, and keeper of the king's privy seal, or two of them'—were the most essential part of the court, and that they were to call in a bishop or temporal lord of the council, and the two chief justices, of the king's bench and of the common pleas, or two other judges in their absence. These justices moreover, it is clear, were only to give advice when their opinion was asked; they were not to be judges of the court. The decisions of the court were to be given by the three great officials after consulting them. But it was to be a decision of the council, not of the justices. Strange to say, however, in actual practice not the presence of the three great officials, nor of two of them, nor even of one of them, was treated as essential to the constitution of the court. Hudson, who, as clerk of the court, had the records before him, says expressly that about the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth years of Henry VII cases were more often heard before the president of the council than before those three officials; which, he says, proves clearly 'that the court then sat not by virtue of that statute, but sat as they antiently had done, and by as antient if not more antient authority than any court in Westminster Hall.' The president of the council never obtained statutory authority to sit with the three other great officers till the twenty-first year of the following reign; yet he actually sat in that court—and even sat without them—about the tenth or twelfth year of Henry VII, that is to say, some eight or ten years after the act was passed by which the constitution of the court seemed to be defined. In short, one would think the act really made little change in the practice of a court which had always existed and was

always ready to hear cases whenever a just pretext could be made out for not applying to ordinary tribunals. A decision of the king's council sitting as a court was the highest possible authority: and the exact constitution of that court was only a matter of minor importance when whoever sat in the seat of judgment always took the highest professional advice. As Mr. Leadam himself says, the constitution of the court set forth in the act of Henry VII was only a counsel of perfection, and Hallam has been quite led astray in regarding the language of the act as proving that the court was a tribunal distinct from the council itself. The main object of the act of Henry VII was, in fact, not to constitute a new tribunal, but to bring a number of specific abuses which were the growth of disorderly times under the cognisance of the king's council; and there is reason to believe that it was very effective for its purpose.

The whole of Mr. Leadam's introduction is a marvel of research; but we cannot say that the second part of it is altogether so satisfactory as the first. Here even the extent of his researches, while seeking for general views, has, it appears to me, led him astray to some extent and obscured the natural deductions that would have been formed from a closer study of the documents themselves. Yet the documents themselves are generally very interesting, and certainly furnish evidences of some things, although the contradictory statements made on opposite sides do occasionally give us pause. That we cannot pronounce safe judgments on the merits of some cases makes it all the more regrettable that none of the judgments pronounced by the court are attainable, for, as is well known, they have all disappeared. I do not suggest, however, that Mr. Leadam has attached too much importance to *ex parte* statements. His error, I should say, is rather in making too little of the documents he has himself brought to light while expatiating at considerable length on evidences derived from other sources.

In some of these excursions I forbear to follow him. How far monastic houses on the eve of the Reformation clung to an 'antiquated land and stock lease system' is a subject rather too deep for me. Nor will I venture altogether to dispute that even large monastic houses were sometimes badly managed. But a statement like the following about Malmesbury invites a little inquiry, not only from the sweeping character of the general assertion but from the definite charge of immorality which it contains:—

> The house was evidently in the latter half of the fifteenth century, like that of Bath, a scene of waste, dissoluteness, and incapacity. From the fact that Abbot Aylie, as we see in the case of Culford *v.* Wotton, had provided for his natural son on the abbey estates, the morals of the rest of the community may be inferred. Despite its large income it was encumbered with debts, and appears to have failed to discharge its pecuniary liabilities in the nature of annuities, corodies, and the like. So notorious was its anarchy that on 27 Nov. 1476 the crown interfered. It took possession of the abbey, its cells, manors, lands, and rents, and committed them to the custody of the prior of Bath, to be administered by him for five years. We have already had a glimpse into the methods of administration of the priors of Bath. Possibly the crown was made acquainted with the injudiciousness of its selection; more probably it became aware that by interfering with an exempt house it was

trenching upon papal prerogative; at any rate on 28 Dec. following a precept was issued to the prior of Bath to stay execution of his commission.

Here are one or two facts and a good deal of speculation. The fact about the king committing the custody of Malmesbury Abbey to the prior of Bath, and the fact that the prior of Bath a month later was ordered to hold his hand, are both derived from the unquestionable authority of the Patent Rolls; and moreover the reason there given for the custodianship is 'because the abbot is blind and cannot govern.' This at least does not make him a very bad man if we do not know it otherwise, and Mr. Leadam himself admits that he was not removed from his office. But is it true that he provided for his natural son on the abbey estates? I wonder if there is any similar case on record; for it strikes me that, though an immoral abbot is not an impossibility, such a mode of providing for him ought to have attracted the notice of ecclesiastical authorities. On examining the case of Culford *v.* Wotton, however, I confess I have some doubts whether the abbot had a natural son at all. Let me give a brief description of this case, which Mr. Leadam has not done in the remarks he has made upon it.

John Culford of Brinkworth brings a complaint against John Wotton, monk and kitchener of Malmesbury Abbey. The petitioner says he came into the manorial court of the abbey at Brinkworth on 12 April 1473, when he became tenant to the abbot and convent, 'and took by copy of the said court, like as Thomas Culford, his father, did,' holding a messuage and lands described. In short, he was his father's heir to a copyhold. Wotton was charged to receive his rent, but, finding that he had made considerable improvements, sent some of his servants with bows and arrows, swords, clubs, and other weapons violently to oust him from possession. They threatened him and his wife, broke open his doors, turned out his goods, and flung his child into the fire, so that it was even then in peril of death; and they still detained from him certain loads of hay and corn, and put him in such fear that he could not come back to his wife, &c. To this Wotton replies that the bill of complaint is malicious and 'insufficient,' *i.e.* that the case might have been heard by an inferior court; that he was not guilty of the alleged riot and taking the child from the cradle, &c.; and as to having entered Culford's messuage, he says 'that the said John Culford held the said mese of his father, the abbot of Malmesbury, at will by copy of court roll,' &c. Mr. Leadam seems to understand from these words that Wotton, the kitchener of the abbey (a very important official of the house), was actually Abbot Aylie's natural son, and, from the complaint made against him, 'that he continued under his father's successor a course of presumption and contempt which had been tolerated by his father.' Surely a much more credible explanation is that a word has been carelessly left out in the above passage. Wotton intended to have written 'that the said John Culford held the said mese of his father (*i.e.* his father's messuage) *of* the abbot of Malmesbury.' The wording of many of these bills and answers is at times a little confusing to a reader not accustomed to the style; but it is not easy to imagine that the only reference in these pleadings to a very gross scandal partly affecting one of the parties should be a mere incidental mention of the fact by the party who was himself affected.

Mr. Leadam's error on this point has quite naturally coloured his view of 'the morals of the rest of the community' and the administration of the monastery.

There are other instances besides this in which I think Mr. Leadam might have given a little description of the cases which he annotates; but I will refer only to one more. The case of Powe and another *v.* Newman is interesting, as Mr. Leadam says, 'as illustrating the history of the ancient archiepiscopal court of audience;' but it is strange that while devoting nearly five large pages to a dissertation on the nature and history of that court he says so very little about the case itself. I do not complain of the general remarks, by which the reader will see that the jurisdiction of that court belonged to the archbishop of Canterbury, not as archbishop but as *legatus natus*, and it was really an anomaly that it was preserved after the Reformation, holding its sittings in London and with the power of citing men from other dioceses. But the interesting thing in this case, which somewhat staggers Mr. Leadam as apparently against the rights of the church, is that a spiritual officer seeks, by application to Archbishop Warham, a remedy at the hands of the council for ill-usage in the execution of his duty. Whether this was an irregularity or not I do not venture to discuss; but I should hardly think so when Archbishop Warham was appealed to. The pleadings were briefly as follows: Thomas Powe and Thomas Towker presented a bill to the archbishop. Powe complained that he, having a suit against John Newman in the court of audience, obtained letters from the auditor suspending Newman 'out of the church;' and Thomas Towker was charged with letters of execution for the parson to denounce the culprit in his own parish church. Towker accordingly carried down the letters and delivered them to the incumbent of Combe-Hay, near Bath; but Newman, knowing this, attacked Towker and had him arrested and sent to prison like a felon, with his hands bound behind him, and also arrested the cattle of Thomas Powe and his father. Newman in his reply says he was not within ten miles of the church when the letters were brought in, and he had Towker arrested for violent conduct towards himself on previous occasions. As to distraining of Powe's cattle, he only did his duty as bailiff to Edward Stradlyng, whose tenant Powe's father was.

JAMES GAIRDNER.

The Cambridge Modern History. Vol. III. The Reformation. (Cambridge: University Press. 1903.)

WHEN twelve competent writers combine to tell the story of the Reformation in eight hundred ample pages, we have good hope of learning exactly what it was that happened at that crisis. The ground has been cleared for them in the previous volume, and we expect to find an account not only of the agents and the process of change, but also of the new systems which have been established and are to exert their influence upon the future of the nations. The strangest point about the present volume is that it is just in this constitutional point that it is defective. Except for Scandinavia, where the bishop of Gibraltar has traced the formation and organisation of Lutheran churches with admirable completeness, we have

no systematic account of that system. Switzerland, at any rate as far as Zwingli's influence reached, is well treated; a somewhat ideal and generalised sketch of Calvin's plan is given by Dr. Fairbairn, and we cannot quarrel with Dr. Maitland because he has not thought fit to describe the actual working of the English church under the Elizabethan settlement. But the book itself is full of good and interesting work. Mr. Stanley Leathes's chapters are excellently thought out and proportioned, and it is not his fault that Bishop Stubbs's account of Charles V, suggesting inevitable comparisons, should have been published almost simultaneously. Mr. Leathes's pages would be a little improved if they were free from names which convey no meaning to an ordinary reader. Gattinara, for instance, is mentioned once or twice in an allusive way. Mr. Dyer, with no more occasion than Mr. Leathes to dwell upon the person, tells us his origin and his office. This surely is right; a general history should be complete in itself, so far as it goes. The choice, however, between omitting names and filling space by describing the bearers is difficult to make, and others of the contributors to this volume have compromised the matter after Mr. Leathes's fashion. When we turn to Germany, the most important scene of the history, we find an exemplification of the disadvantage of divided responsibility. We begin with an article, full and sympathetic, upon Luther's antecedents and early career. Dr. Lindsay sets before us a religious movement; we are led on to the time when the protestant organisation of Germany is becoming inevitable. But Dr. Lindsay leaves us when Luther disappears into the Wartburg; and henceforth we may almost say that Luther leaves us too. The thread is snapped; the remainder of the story is told not only from a different point of view, but in a different spirit. It does not gain by the change. After all, powerfully as the spirit of particularism may have worked, though not more powerfully in Saxony than in Bavaria, the German Reformation was a religious movement, and he who would make the changes it wrought in the nation intelligible must treat it from that point of view.

Mr. Pollard is far too political, and his indifference to the other side of the matter has betrayed him into actual error. He tells us that John Frederick of Saxony forced Amsdorf into the see of Naumburg. This is a very misleading account of what was on Luther's part an interesting and important theological experiment, mere robbery as it may have been on that of the Elector. Small though the diocese was, according to the German scale, it covered parts of the dominions of several princes; Luther and his patron combined to consecrate an evangelical superintendent who should have jurisdiction over so much of the diocese as had been under the secular rule of the bishop and was now seized by the Elector. The whole historical question of church government was involved, and Luther, by his act, publicly repudiated the ancient system. It was not, what Mr. Pollard says it was, the intrusion of a bishop; at least, we ought to have been told, and it is important that we should know, that the title was now being employed in a novel sense. This is not the only instance where Mr. Pollard should have imparted the knowledge which no doubt he possesses. And if it may have been difficult to find room for incidents, at any rate the process, in some of its

varieties, by which the new systems of church government were introduced, should have been described. Bugenhagen, to name but one agent, deserved as large a space as has been allowed to the dull and confused campaigns of the Peasants' War. Yet here we are disappointed, and Scandinavia has to supply the defects of Germany in this respect, as also in regard to the constitution of Lutheranism. As to the system of the Reformed churches, so far as it differed from pure Calvinism, we receive no information at all. And in a narrative which is only too political we look in vain for an account of the territorial changes which were among the most important results of the German Reformation. We are not told which were accomplished by direct annexation and which by legal fictions, nor what states, and in what proportion, profited by them. The student who seeks to discover how, for instance, Frederick duke of York was reigning bishop of Osnabrück till dispossessed by Napoleon will justly resent his failure to find enlightenment in so spacious a history. No doubt the peace of Westphalia will give the opportunity for reviewing this series of changes, but they would have been more in place if directly connected with the revolution that caused them.

It seems ungracious to dwell at such length upon omissions in what is a careful and compact record, with few wasted words or unimportant facts. The same praise may be given to the annalistic treatment of English history. It is very conscientious and concise, with touches of picturesque and sometimes familiar detail, as when Bishop Fisher's cook appears in Dr. Gairdner's chapter. But while the other English chapters are written, and written admirably, in the usual spirit of history, Dr. Maitland has tried the experiment of being commentator as well as historian. With all his characteristic cleverness, with wide knowledge, with abundant humour (of which it would be unfair to take his division of our Reformers into 'Knoxians and Coxians' as an average specimen), and with an absolute want of sympathy, he narrates the Elizabethan settlement. No reader can fail to be the wiser for Dr. Maitland's instruction; perhaps, if he has approached the chapter in a more normal frame of mind, he may end it with a clearer knowledge than Dr. Maitland's own. It is a pity that Scottish affairs are combined with English. Both nations suffer, and Scotland is in the worse case.

The other chapters which deal with national reformations are all excellent, though it would have been well to spare a page or two for the beginning of that in Hungary, which had its share in paralysing the nation and could not be omitted when Dr. Collins has to relate its Unitarian development. In regard to Switzerland it might have been worth while to mention the causes, so far as they can be determined, which induced each canton or league to take its side; no great space would have been required for an addition which would have made the record more complete and more interesting. Of the biographical chapters the only one that raises doubt is Dr. Fairbairn's. Does it represent the real Calvin? Has not the psychology mastered the history, and does he not read the growth of the church that Calvin founded into the purposes of the founder? We ought surely to have been told that in practice he and his followers were the most clerically minded of men. But it is noteworthy that we might read this volume through without learning how

professionally jealous were the reformers at large, and how resolute to surrender as little as possible of the inheritance into which they had entered. There is one chapter which might surely, when so much is omitted, have been justly curtailed. The efforts after a protestant reform in Italy and Spain led to nothing. It is a touching story, and not much more; had it been cut down and a good deal of the last chapter, in which Dr. Fairbairn summarises the views of many mere eccentrics, been similarly reduced, there would have been more room for a comprehensive survey of the whole reforming current of thought. Dr. Fairbairn, sticking less closely to his Calvin than the other writers to their subjects, has shown how broad and interesting a generalisation he could have offered. Of the remaining chapters, that by Dr. F. X. Kraus is rather material for thought than formal history, and Mr. Lawrence's account of the Council of Trent is most judicious in keeping to a direct narrative and avoiding those theological questions which had ceased, after the first stage of the Reformation, to be essential factors in the dispute. The Tridentine definitions, with their emphatic recognition of the fact that cleavage was complete, belong rather to the later history of the Roman communion than to that of the Reformation.

The volume, as a whole, does tell the reader who will seek for them most of the facts he will wish to know. But he must be diligent in his search. The history of France, for instance, has to be collected from Dr. Fairbairn, Mr. Leathes, and Mr. Tilley, and the student who would master it must do his share of the historian's work in combining the scattered information. This, however, is an inevitable result of Lord Acton's scheme, and we must be grateful to the writers for the excellent and trustworthy work that they have accomplished, and not least for the bibliography. It is true that some of the lists are encumbered with obsolete or superficial books, and that some are obviously defective. But others, and notably that for Germany, are admirably comprehensive.

E. W. WATSON.

Notes on the Authentic Portraits of Mary Queen of Scots. Based on the Researches of the late Sir George Scharf, K.C.B. Rewritten in the light of new information by LIONEL CUST. (Murray: London. 1903.)

THE nature and scope of Mr. Cust's book are set forth in the title. The author does not pretend to discuss the vexed questions of the queen's life, which, he thinks, 'seem to be no nearer a definite settlement than before.' Most of them are settled fairly well, but the public which forms its own opinion on tradition will never know it. In the same way, evidence will never shake the belief of Scottish families in their own portrait of the queen given by her to their ancestor. You vainly point out the date and the name of the artist on the canvas—a name and a date of the eighteenth century. The oldest aunt replies that the late painter merely 'restored' the piece, which, with its legend, travels about to loan exhibitions. Usually, the queen holds a white rose in her hand, though the white rose, of course, became a symbol of loyalty about a hundred and thirty years after her death. Mr. Cust naturally begins with coins and medals. The marriage medal of Mary and the Dauphin,

1558, shows a rather insignificant-looking girl, with not bad features, who develops into the really graceful and handsome portrait of the wife of Darnley, 'his Majesty's dearest mother with the naked craig'—that is, *décolletée*. The enthusiast who wants evidence for Mary's beauty need not look further. There is no genuine portrait in oil of Mary in France: the Windsor miniature is apparently based on a chalk drawing now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The French artists could not render what we call 'charm'—the portraits, though accurate in contour no doubt, are stiff and dull. A miniature at the Uffizi (plate vi., fig. 1) in a *toque* seems to us be the nearest extant relation to some authentic portrait of Mary in a *toque* and white plume. A descendant of the original, really pleasing, is in Lord Haddington's collection at Tyninghame, and we understand that a document proves it to have been given by James VI., with a portrait of himself, to the Lord Melrose, later earl of Haddington, who long governed Scotland after the union of the crowns. There are countless variants on this early original. Nobody can detect beauty in the drawing of Mary as dowager of France, in white mourning, with the sidelong glance inherited by the Chevalier de St. George (James III and VIII). Many old portraits descend from this drawing, which naturally cannot exhibit 'the exquisite pallor of the queen's complexion.' This brilliant pallor, with red lips, red-brown eyes, hair of a bright brown, and constant mobility of expression, with a finely formed neck and figure, and a tongue that

> Could sing fish out of the water,
> And water out of a stone,

a fascination that her foes acknowledged and feared, were all the weapons of Mary in the long and hopeless struggle of her life. We have little confidence in the bronze bust in the Louvre (plate xi.). In Scotland there was no native painter, and we know not any portrait of Mary done in Scotland by a foreign artist. Of the various repetitions of the Sheffield portrait that in the collection of the duke of Devonshire seems to us probably the most characteristic (plate xiv., date 1578). The portraits at Hardwick, Cobham, Hatfield, and the National Portrait Gallery are, we agree with Mr. Cust, probably contemporary copies in large of a miniature done at Sheffield in 1577, for the queen's faithful ambassador in Paris, Archbishop Beaton of Glasgow. The Morton portrait, after the Sheffield portrait, but without 'idolatrous' emblems, is by the best artist of all. In 1577, when Mary was certainly sitting for her portrait at Sheffield, Morton said that he 'would rather serve her and her race than any of the world, as God was his judge,' so Lord Ogilvy reported to Archbishop Beaton, for whom Mary's portrait of 1577 was done. Beaton may have gratified Morton with a copy by a Parisian artist, to encourage his repentance, in which the queen did not believe.[1] We make Mr. Cust a present of this suggestion. Mr. Cust deals agreeably with the many false portraits, of which the Fraser Tytler example is so like the Mary of Mr. Hewlett's novel, *The Queen's Quair*, that we reject it with regret. But, alas, the eyes are blue, which is fatal. The tiny Penicuik miniature, in a gold jewel,

[1] Hosack, *Mary Stuart*, ii., Appendix B, from a manuscript of the Scots College.

not mentioned by Mr. Cust, is a genuine gift from Mary to one of the Mowbray ladies.

Mr. Cust's book entirely succeeds in fulfilling its purpose, and ought to be in every Marian library. A. LANG.

Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1578–9, preserved in the Public Record Office. Edited by ARTHUR JOHN BUTLER, M.A. (London: H.M. Stationery Office. 1903.)

MR. BUTLER, having once started with his *Calendar*, is proceeding with it apace, and barely a year has elapsed between the publication of his first and that of his second volume. At this rate the foreign calendar for Elizabeth's reign will be completed in less than a quarter of a century, and younger students of the Tudor period may reasonably hope to have the materials for a judgment on Elizabeth's foreign policy accessible before they die. No such felicity apparently awaits the student of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; for, unless parliament grows more liberal with its grants, or a different plan is adopted by Sir H. Maxwell-Lyte, one or two centuries must still pass before posterity will be in a position to write the history of the later Stuart or of the Hanoverian diplomacy. Seriously, we would ask the deputy-keeper of the Records whether it would not be possible to start some one on the Foreign Calendar at 1603 and a third editor at 1688 or 1714.

The present volume relates almost exclusively to affairs in the Netherlands, where things were going from bad to worse for England and prosperously for no one. Seldom has there been in any country a more confused welter of intrigue. Don John was standing at bay in the south, surrounded by three hostile forces, the Prince of Orange, the German Duke Casimir, and the French Duke of Alençon. Elizabeth's professed aim was to induce Philip II to grant the Netherlands local liberties and the insurgents to recognise the sovereignty of Philip; she dreaded equally their conquest by the Spaniards and their 'liberation' by the French. Finding her mediation powerless to achieve this end, she practically withdrew her countenance from the Netherlands, and apparently trusted to a flirtation with Alençon to protect her from the probable effects of the success of Spain.[1] Her conduct seems to have disgusted almost all her council—not merely the forward party of Leicester, Walsingham, and Davison, but Burghley and even Sussex and Hatton;—one would like more light on her advisers in this course. She defied their remonstrances in a fashion which proves her strength of will, though not her wisdom; for her conduct must be regarded as one of the two chief causes which so nearly brought the rising Dutch republic to grief and permanently divided the Netherlands into two not very friendly states. The other cause was undeniably religious intolerance on the part of the Netherlanders themselves. In the autumn of 1578 their cause seemed almost won, when a violent outburst of the Calvinists of Ghent against the catholics alienated the Walloons and the majority of the Flemings. The death of Don John prevented Spain from immediately reaping the advantage, and at first war seemed probable between Alençon as the

[1] See Walsingham in no. 584.

champion of the Walloons and Casimir as the Calvinist protagonist. Neither was, however, very capable; and Alexander of Parma soon began to gather the catholics around his standard and make head against the protestants. 'The war which is about to begin,' wrote a sagacious observer, 'will be a war for religion' (no. 523); theological hatreds had shattered the national movement against Spanish tyranny. Fortunately for the Dutch they were a stubborn race; half a dozen battles, wrote the prophetic Walsingham (no. 90), will not 'put the king of Spain into possession of these countries, which perhaps to some will seem a paradox, but in time they will learn to be of another opinion.'

The score or so of letters relating to France are not of great importance, though Poulet has perceived by 1579 that the design in France was 'to root out religion by all means possible.' It is extraordinary to find not a single document on England's relations with Spain during this year; the correspondence of Mendoza is, of course, in the *Calendar of Simancas MSS.*, but it appears to be a fact that while Mendoza was ambassador in London there was no English representative at the court of Philip II, and we are unable to supplement Mr. Butler's *Calendar* by any references to the Spanish documents in the British Museum. As in the case of the previous volume there are, however, over a hundred letters, of which Mr. Butler takes no account, relating to Flanders, 1578–9, in Cotton MS. Galba, C. vi., some of which are indispensable for the understanding of this volume. So far does the exclusion of the British Museum materials go that when Mr. Butler notes a version in Kervyn de Lettenhove of a Museum document he does not give the reference, but merely says 'from another copy.' Except for the splendid lapse of the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, the gaze of the editors of *State Papers* is rigidly confined within the four walls of the Record Office, and Mr. Butler himself has a plaintive remark (p. xxi) that Kervyn, 'being a foreigner, was able to utilise the English documents without regard to their place of custody.' No one, therefore, can master the diplomatic history of the Netherlands and England in this year without recourse to the British Museum, to Kervyn de Lettenhove, and to Muller and to Diegerick, as well as to this *Calendar*.

We have no space for detailed criticism. The proofs have been read with much greater care than before, and the list of errata appears to be almost exhaustive. The notes at the end of no. 77 are not 'for a letter home,' but for a reply by the English government, probably no. 91. In no. 32 the 'wanns of Harwich,' which puzzle Mr. Butler, should be 'Wands,' and he will find an explanation of the phrase in a note to Dr. Gairdner's *Calendar* for 1544, no. 249. As a whole the calendaring is done thoroughly well. A. F. POLLARD.

Queen Elizabeth and the Levant Company. By H. G. ROSEDALE, D.D. Published under the direction of the Royal Society of Literature. (London: Frowde. 1904.)

THIS volume contains a few interesting despatches from Sir Edward Barton at Constantinople during the year 1595 relating to the accession of Sultan Mehemet III, and the present which the accession of a new sovereign obliged the English ambassador to make. It gives also a

very curious account of the delivery of this present to the sultan in 1599. But the *pièce de résistance* is a narrative of the death of Murad III and the circumstances attending the accession of Mehemet, with character sketches of both sovereigns. This narrative was written by a curious Jew in Italian, and a twelve-page facsimile of it, admirably executed, is inserted. The document does not deserve this honour, for it is, on Dr. Rosedale's own showing, merely a corrupt copy, or perhaps a duplicate, of the original. The editor speaks of it as a piece of doctored or spurious historical literature used to influence the action of Queen Elizabeth and her council by Barton. According to him it was simply one of many clever schemes devised by Barton to gain time before asking the Turkey Company for a present for the new sovereign, a demand which was likely to meet with considerable opposition, as they had just sent one to the deceased Murad III. Its object was to awaken the interest of the queen and her advisers in favour of the new sultan, and to induce her to supply these propitiatory offerings; and it was eventually successful. The evidence adduced by Dr. Rosedale is not sufficient to prove his theory. The document cannot be fairly described as 'spurious,' even if, like other newsletters of the kind, it contains erroneous statements, and the events it recorded were quite of sufficient public interest for the ambassador to forward it to his government without any other motive than to inform them of events in Turkey. There is nowhere any proof that the production and transmission of the narrative were dictated by the underhand diplomacy suggested. In short, Dr. Rosedale is much too ingenious to be convincing.

The book is beautifully printed, and illustrated with portraits and facsimiles in large numbers. The expense of its production is out of all proportion to the value of its contents, and it is to be regretted that the Royal Society of Literature, if it intends to publish historical documents, should not spend its money on work of some real value to historians. The editorial work is not well done. It is absurd to describe a document vaguely as in the possession of the Record Office or the British Museum. Two documents are cited from Hakluyt's *Voyages*, but no proper reference for either is given.[1] Some mention should also have been made of the paper by Mr. Pears on the Spanish Armada and the Ottoman Porte, published in this Review for July 1893, which illustrates the subjects dealt with in Dr. Rosedale's book.

C. H. Firth.

Les Infortunes d'une Petite-fille d'Henri IV, Marguerite d'Orléans, Grande-Duchesse de Toscane (1645–1721). Par E. Rodocanachi. (Paris: Flammarion. *s.a.*)

La Mission de M. de Forbin-Janson, Évêque de Marseille, plus tard Évêque de Beauvais, auprès du Grand-Duc et de la Grande-Duchesse de Toscane, Mars—Mai, 1675; Récit d'un Témoin. Par C. Douais, Évêque de Beauvais. (Paris: Picard. 1904.)

Marguerite d'Orléans, granddaughter of Henri IV and grand duchess of Tuscany, was not unlike her half-sister, 'la Grande Mademoiselle,' in energy, talkativeness, vivacity, and strength of will, and was besides

[1] See Hakluyt, ed. 1599, ii. 303, 311.

a famous beauty, compared even in middle life to the statue known as the 'Venus of Arles.' She was married in girlhood to Cosimo, son of Ferdinand of Tuscany, who afterwards became grand duke as Cosimo III. An unwilling bride, for her fancy had already been captured by the gallant, handsome prince, Charles of Lorraine, she had been educated with a view to pleasing the young king, Louis XIV, to whom Duke Gaston fondly hoped to marry her. She was an enthusiastic horsewoman, devoted to hunting, dancing, and music, and just fitted for the gay, unfettered, frivolous life of the French court. She had hardly arrived in Florence before she discovered that her husband was priggish, prudish, and pompous, repulsively ugly, ruled by his mother and the priests who had educated him, rigidly following the dictates of a superstitious, over-scrupulous, and misdirected conscience, without any sympathy for the social pleasures which Marguerite loved. The Tuscan court was a model of frigid etiquette in the Spanish style; Marguerite's most innocent frivolities were looked upon with disapproval by the severely pious grand duchess, who had long lived as a nun, apart from her husband, whose scientific pursuits she considered dangerous to salvation. The grand duke took an interest in literature and science, and Marguerite found him more tolerable. To please her, and obtain the grandson for whom he longed, he tried to enliven the court, but Marguerite did not make the slightest attempt to accommodate herself to her surroundings. She was determined so to disgust the Tuscans that they would be thankful to send her back to France. She flouted and mocked her husband, gave crown jewels to her French serving-women, and carried on a clandestine correspondence, afterwards discovered, with Prince Charles; in fact, she was said to *faire le diable de cent façons*. Finally she refused altogether to live with the prince, declaring that she would rather go to hell without him than to heaven with him. However, after a considerable period of solitude, her resolution failed her and she returned to court, but only to quarrel with her husband once more and plan an escape to France, disguised as a gipsy. Cosimo went on his travels for a time, and she behaved better when Ferdinand's death made her grand duchess.

Finding herself however excluded from any share in the government by her mother-in-law, Marguerite fled to one of Cosimo's villas and refused to return. French envoys, letters from Louis XIV, even a bishop armed with papal threats and exhortations, failed to move her; she was kept in strict confinement, but preferred a prison to a penitentiary such as the court had become under Cosimo and his mother. Cosimo had at first been really in love with her, so far as his flabby nature could sustain such a sentiment; but he was now tired of her, and, when she declared that their marriage must be invalid, because it had been concluded against her will, his scrupulous conscience took fright and he was glad to be rid of her. Declaring that she wished to live in retirement and devotion, she was allowed to return to France and reside in the convent of Montmartre. But her pious aspirations were short-lived; her liveliness and misfortunes secured for her the favour of the chivalrous king and his gay court, and she plunged into its dissipations, scoffing at Cosimo's remonstrances and holding him up to ridicule. She travelled where she pleased, got deeply into debt, and, when she could not be at court, amused herself

with the company of a series of grooms and valets, to whom she permitted compromising familiarities. Cosimo worried himself continually about her; all her actions were reported by his spies, and he made himself miserable with jealousy and wounded pride. Marguerite kept up a secret correspondence with her eldest son, Prince Ferdinand, whose character resembled hers, and who, consequently, was on very bad terms with his father. For years she continued to be a thorn in Cosimo's side, but age at length sobered her; she lost her influence at court, devoted herself to good works, wrote affectionate letters to Cosimo, even embroidered a screen for him, and lived in complete retirement until her death, at the age of seventy-six, in 1721.

M. Rodocanachi's book forms an interesting study of an unusual type of character, and throws many side-lights on life and on the sometimes remarkably unconventional manners of court and convent in France under Louis XIV, with entertaining glimpses of that king, Mademoiselle, and other notable personages. As a monograph on a princess of not first-rate importance it is perhaps a little lengthy, and Marguerite's flirtations with her valets become tiresome before we have done with them.

Monseigneur Douais' interest in a former bishop of Beauvais has led him to study the diplomatic mission to the court of Tuscany with which this prelate was charged in 1673; and he has obtained possession of a *Relation* of that mission written by one of the bishop's suite, M. de Faur-Ferriès. Monseigneur Douais gives an account of this *Relation* which supplements M. Rodocanachi's narrative of this mission. Faur-Ferriès's sympathies are naturally all given to Marguerite. He states that Cosimo's mother had set her son against his bride even before her arrival, and draws a most unflattering portrait of the prince, emphasising his ugliness, stoutness, bigotry, and stupidity. Cosimo is described as one of those people who are amiable abroad and sulky at home; he 'never speaks except on business;' 'usually drives out alone, the better to maintain his dignity;' 'instead of laughing when the grand duchess tried to chaff him, he only showed annoyance.' Soon after the marriage he was mortally offended because in fun she cut off one of his big hanging sleeves. Marguerite, on the contrary, is altogether beautiful and charming; she won the Frenchman's heart by her gaiety and spirits, in spite of adverse circumstances, and by her love of music and delicate flattery of his musical performances. One point perfectly characteristic of Louis XIV and his school of diplomacy must not be omitted. The bishop's final and most important argument with Marguerite was that she should submit and return to her husband in order that she might have the honour of exercising her talents to the advantage of French commercial and political designs.

The book contains some letters illustrative of the mission drawn from the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères.

K. DOROTHEA VERNON.

Catalogue of the Pepysian MSS. Edited by J. R. TANNER. Vol. I. (Navy Records Society. 1903.)

MR. TANNER'S volume consists of an introduction to the catalogue and two lists. It is to be followed by a full calendar of the fourteen volumes

of Admiralty Letters in the Pepysian Library at Magdalene College, Cambridge, and, it is to be hoped, by some catalogue of the miscellaneous naval papers in the same collection. The introduction is based on a series of articles published by Mr. Tanner in the *English Historical Review* in 1897 and 1899 (xii. 17, 679, xiv. 47, 261), but the articles have been enlarged and revised, so that the introduction contains much new information. Mr. Tanner follows the Pepysian papers very closely, summarising the evidence they supply under eight heads—government, finance, men, pay, victuals, discipline, ships, and guns. He arranges his matter in an extremely clear and methodical manner, and succeeds in concisely stating a great number of exact facts and details in the comparatively small space of 250 pages. The book is a most valuable contribution to the history of English naval administration, and serves as a continuation to Mr. Oppenheim's work on the period before 1660.

The net result of Mr. Tanner's introduction is to prove that the statesmen of the Restoration were far better administrators than they are usually represented as being. The period from 1660 to 1688 was on the whole, in spite of certain disgraceful episodes, a period of progress. Certain improvements in administration initiated during the Commonwealth and Protectorate were now incorporated into the permanent system of the country, and improvements in shipbuilding were also introduced. Mr. Tanner points out that this progress was partly due to the interest taken by Charles II in the development of the navy, of which he collects some evidence, and still more to the industry and zeal of the duke of York (pp. 245–7). James left his mark on the organisation of the navy, for the instructions issued by him as lord high admiral in 1662 remained in force until the admiralty was reorganised at the beginning of the nineteenth century. They were based upon instructions issued by the earl of Northumberland in 1640, revised and improved by the duke, probably with the assistance of Sir William Penn (p. 20). Macaulay goes too far when he sneers at James as a man 'who would have made a respectable clerk in the dockyard at Chatham.' He was certainly much more than this, and showed himself a capable administrator. Wellington, reviewing another part of James's official career, judged him as favourably as Mr. Tanner does. 'He was a very weak fellow,' said Wellington to Lord Stanhope, 'but he had great skill nevertheless for the head of a department. His arrangements at the ordnance were excellent. When I was master-general I brought it back very much to what he had made it.'[1] Mr. Tanner rightly praises the services of Pepys himself. 'We may fairly claim for this great public servant that he did more than any one else under a king "that did hate the very sight and thoughts of business" to apply business principles to naval administration.' The volume is appropriately dedicated 'to the memory of Samuel Pepys, a great public servant.'

Mr. Tanner prints two documents only in this instalment of his catalogue, but they are both lengthy and of great value. One is a 'Register of the Ships of the Royal Navy' from 1660 to 1688, showing their burden, their force, when and where they were built, and what became of them. To this he adds a 'Register of Sea Officers,' giving the

[1] Stanhope, *Notes of Conversations with the Duke of Wellington*, p. 66.

dates of the commissions of all officers of the navy, from flag officers to lieutenants, during the same twenty-eight years. It is a very great advantage to any one interested in the history of the reigns of Charles and James to have these two lists placed at his disposal. In conclusion one error of omission on the editor's part must be pointed out. Mr. Tanner does not seem to realise how large a part of the manuscript collections of Mr. Pepys are in the Bodleian Library now. He refers, it is true, to the summary account of them given by Dr. Macray in his *Annals of the Bodleian Library*, but he forgets to point out that these papers are described at length in the *Catalogue of the Rawlinson MSS.*, published by Dr. Macray in 1862. Five-and-twenty volumes of the miscellaneous correspondence of Pepys are there catalogued and indexed, and about as many other volumes are more briefly described. One of those volumes is a list of officers similar to that printed by Mr. Tanner.[2] Another contains two versions of the 'Register of the Ships in the Royal Navy,' one extending from 1660 to 1675, the other continued down to 1686.[3] It is apparently to the first of these lists of vessels that Pepys refers in the letter quoted by Mr. Tanner in his preface, complaining of the difficulty he has experienced in compiling such a table. Though the Bodleian collection of correspondence is of very much less value than that contained in the Pepysian Library, it is of so much value that the existence of these supplementary letters and duplicate documents should have been pointed out by Mr. Tanner, especially as they are fully catalogued, and can be consulted with much more ease than the papers at Magdalene College, Cambridge. With the exception of this omission, which Mr. Tanner can easily repair in his later volumes, no fault can be found with his editorial work. C. H. Firth.

The Popish Plot: a Study in the History of the Reign of Charles II. By John Pollock, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London: Duckworth. 1903.)

This noteworthy and in many ways brilliant book is an illustration of the influence which can be exerted by a really eminent scholar. When Lord Acton was appointed to the Cambridge chair, it was forecasted that, whether successful or not as a lecturer, he would at any rate set people to attempt the solution of historical conundrums. To Mr. Pollock, who dedicates his book to Lord Acton's memory, was propounded the triple conundrum: 'What was going on between Coleman and Père la Chaise, how Oates got hold of the wrong story, and who killed Godfrey?' and, though few may assert that he has succeeded in finding the correct answers, yet, in making the attempt, he has given a lucid and very readable account of a most difficult and intricate period of English history.

One of the ablest chapters of the book is that in the first part which describes the Roman catholic designs. That after the Restoration the Roman catholics had confident and not unreasonable expectations, not only of a relaxation of the penal laws, but of an eventual recovery of ascendency, is proved by the history of the treaty of Dover and of the

[2] Rawlinson MS. A. 199. [3] *Ibid.* 197.

reign of James II. These expectations were for the time disappointed by the revocation of the Declaration of Indulgence, the passing of the Test Act, and that vacillating foreign policy which appeared at last to lean decisively to the protestant side when the Princess Mary was married to William of Orange. It was in the highest degree natural that bitter disappointment should find expression in indignant denunciation of Charles II as ungrateful to loyal subjects and as a deserter of a cause to which he was regarded as committed by conscience and conviction. In striking contrast to the conduct of Charles was that of his brother. James's first wife had died a convert to the faith; he had incurred odium by his second marriage with a loyal catholic; he had sacrificed an office in which he had won high distinction rather than take the test; and he had endangered his personal safety and his prospects of succession by absenting himself from the services of the established church and by resolute resistance to the efforts of Anglican prelates to bring about his re-conversion. Both in England and abroad, Roman catholics looked forward to the accession of so loyal a prince, and hot-headed enthusiasts may well have desired to hasten the auspicious event.

It is not strictly relevant to Mr. Pollock's argument that the Roman catholics may have been mistaken in their estimate of Charles's policy, and that he had been forced to dissemble rather than to alter or abandon his previous policy. Their opinion was based upon his obvious actions, not upon his unknown motives or intentions. But Mr. Pollock does not seem to admit the possibility of a mistake. He deliberately asserts that 'from the moment when he revoked the Declaration of Indulgence the catholics had nothing to hope from Charles' (p. 30), and again, that Charles 'had definitely adopted a policy adverse to the catholics' (p. 69). These statements are not only unnecessary to support his main contention, but they seem to involve a misreading of an important period of the reign. Danby endeavoured to revive the alliance of the crown with the cavaliers which had existed in the early years of the reign, and to detach from the country party those loyalists who had been driven to join it by their distrust of the king and their hatred of the policy associated with the ascendency of 'the Cabal.' This scheme failed, says Mr. Pollock, but he hardly grasps the real cause of its failure. The fact was that Charles did not cordially adopt this policy or make it his own. The king and Danby were never in complete or cordial agreement. If they had been, there is no reason to suppose that they could not have been successful. But Charles had not yet been sufficiently convinced of the impossibility of founding a strong monarchy upon the alliance of Roman catholics and protestant dissenters, and of the paramount importance of securing the unhesitating and unqualified support of the Anglican church. This conviction was supplied by the stormy events between 1678 and 1681; and when once Charles had learned this great lesson, he had no difficulty in crushing all opposition. The resolute abandonment of all idea of a Roman catholic revival or of a policy of indulgence was a result rather than a cause of the Popish plot.

It is as well known to us as it was to Oates that in 1678 there was general discontent among Roman Catholics, and that extreme malcontents, whether rightly or wrongly, blamed the king for having first encouraged

and then thwarted their aspirations. That there were schemes afloat for the furtherance of their interests, and that these schemes were based upon the expectation of foreign assistance, is proved by the extant correspondence of Coleman. It is true that the more important letters do not go later than 1675; but, in spite of Coleman's asseverations, it is impossible to believe that later letters were not intentionally destroyed, and they were presumably more incriminating than those which were left. The disappearance of these letters, though it failed to save Coleman from contemporary and from posthumous condemnation, makes it impossible to give a satisfactory answer to the first of Lord Acton's questions. And it also helps to obscure the second problem. Supposing that there was *a* Catholic plot, either full-grown or in process of growth, what relation did it bear to *the* plot as divulged by Oates? If there was open discontent against the king, was there a conspiracy against the king's life? If Oates knew so much, why did he not know more? Above all, why did he blunder about the central and most important episode in his story, the Jesuit 'consult' on 24 April 1678? There unquestionably was a 'consult' on that date, but the meeting and its business had nothing in common with Oates's description. It was held at St. James's, the Duke of York's residence, and not at the White Horse tavern in the Strand: it was not a specially summoned meeting, but the normal congregation of the province, which was held every three years and was attended by forty members, consisting of certain officials and the senior fathers of the province. The minutes, drawn up by the secretary, are still extant, and a translation from the Latin has been published by Father Gerard, S.J., in the *Month* for September 1903 (vol. cii. pp. 311–316). No doubt the minutes are not necessarily exhaustive, but when added to the meeting-place and to the character and composition of the meeting, they are enough to convince any unprejudiced reader that no such business as Oates alleged was discussed at this assembly. It might, of course, be urged that another meeting of Jesuits, not necessarily of the same members, was held on the same date at the White Horse, and that Oates confused this with the regular 'consult' of which he may have heard at St. Omer. But there is no evidence for such a second meeting, and the conjecture is needless except for the impossible task of vindicating Oates's veracity. And if the conjecture be rejected, it is needless to cavil, as Mr. Pollock does, at the evidence adduced to prove that Oates was at St. Omer at the date of the congregation. If he were not present, which Mr. Pollock asserts, he could invent imaginary proceedings at St. Omer just as well as in London.

It is to the third of Lord Acton's mysteries, the death of Godfrey, that Mr. Pollock has devoted his keenest attention; and his attempt to solve the apparently insoluble has excited a good deal of interest among historical students. His views may be briefly summarised. He holds that Coleman, when Godfrey communicated to him the substance of Oates's depositions, was led by his eagerness to prove their falsehood to betray the secret that the 'consult' of 24 April met at St. James's Palace. James subsequently admitted to Reresby that if Oates had known this 'he would have cut out a fine spot of work for me.' The Jesuits, learning from Coleman his fatal indiscretion, determined to avert the imminent

risk of disclosure by removing the innocent but untrustworthy confidant. This supplies the often-sought motive for Godfrey's murder. But Mr. Pollock does not stop here: he is prepared to identify the actual perpetrators of the murder. Prance, he says, brought false evidence against innocent men. But this evidence was that of a man who knew the real facts and must have been an accomplice. And Prance, in spite of his perjury, or even in consequence of it, continued to enjoy the favour of the Jesuits. Hence Mr. Pollock concludes that his evidence against Green, Berry, and Hill was a deliberate effort to screen other persons; these must have been the men accused by Bedloe, and they were therefore the real criminals.

It is impossible in these pages to analyse at length this suggested solution of the mystery. But it is obviously rather ingenious than convincing. There is no evidence for Coleman's supposed disclosure to Godfrey, which is as purely conjectural as the most famous of Bentley's emendations of Horace. It is not certain that Coleman knew the secret about the 'consult,' and if he did he must have been a very poor conspirator to blurt it out on such comparatively slight provocation. For there was no reason at the time to regard Oates's story as involving any serious danger, and there is less reason to think that Coleman so regarded it. Nor can it be proved that Coleman, after making the initial blunder, tried to redeem it by confessing his folly to the Jesuits. And yet it is upon such unsupported hypotheses that the whole case against the Jesuits depends. Nor does Mr. Pollock improve his case by his naïve confession of the methods by which he reached his conclusions. He appeals to a rather misleading metaphor, suggested by the late Mr. S. R. Gardiner, of the search for a key to open a locked door. A door may frequently be unlocked by several keys, which are not necessarily identical; and the fact that one of them serves the purpose by no means proves that it was originally made to fit the lock. Medical evidence at an inquest often proves that a wound might be inflicted in several different ways; but this does not help to prove that it was actually inflicted in one particular way. The evil of a preconceived theory is that it almost unconsciously leads the inquirer to read the evidence so as to fit it into the theory. The death of Godfrey remains an unsolved mystery. Suicide, not improbable in itself and the favourite theory of Roman catholic writers, is negatived by the medical evidence, and by the description of the corpse given by the majority of those who saw it. There is neither evidence nor probability to favour a contention that he was murdered by personal enemies or for private ends. That the crime was committed in order to stimulate popular belief in the plot and indignation against the Roman catholics, is an *ex post facto* conjecture of the wildest kind. The informers were not at the time either numerous enough or sufficiently organised to carry out such a far-sighted and ingenious crime. The balance of probability, but nothing more, favours the view that ignorant and hot-headed catholics acted on the belief that their cause could be served by the death of the fussy and ill-fated magistrate.

On one minor but not insignificant point Mr. Pollock is inclined, and probably with justice, to give Oates the benefit of the doubt. Many writers, following L'Estrange and accepting a statement of Simpson Tonge, have stated that Oates and Tonge conspired together to concoct a

false charge against the Jesuits as early as 1676, and that Oates spent the intervening time in a deliberate search for material out of which to build the story of a plot. The evidence of Simpson Tonge is worthless, and he more than once contradicted himself on this point. So far as it has any importance it affects character rather than facts. If it were true, it would make Oates an even more deliberate perjurer than he was, and it would make Tonge more of a villain and less of a dupe. Neither conclusion is necessary to discredit the evidence subsequently produced. It is infinitely more probable that Oates wilfully confused together the loose talk of catholic malcontents with the traces of a plot which he believed he had discovered at St. Omer, and that once embarked in his career he was led on by egregious vanity and an ingrained passion for lying to erect the monstrous edifice of preposterous untruths which has excited at once the wonder and the horror of later generations.

Mr. Pollock's later chapters are not without interest, but they will probably arrest less attention than those on Godfrey's death. His sketch of the political history from 1679 to 1681 adds little or nothing to our knowledge of the period, and his analysis of the evidence produced at the various trials for treason is chiefly noteworthy for his vindication of the impartiality of Chief Justice Scroggs. The interesting ethical questions raised by the attitude towards the plot of Charles II and of the opposition leaders are passed over with comparatively slight notice. It is true that he rejects the assertion of Dalrymple that the plot was an invention of whig politicians, but it is so palpably absurd that it hardly needed refutation. Far more important is the question as to how far Shaftesbury and his colleagues intentionally stimulated public credulity in a story which they themselves disbelieved, and deliberately hounded innocent men to death in order to serve the interests of their party.

R. Lodge.

Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, Prime Minister (1710–14). By E. S. Roscoe. (London: Chatto & Windus. 1902.)

In a pleasantly written volume, illustrated by twelve portraits, Mr. Roscoe has said all that can be said for the most enigmatic of English statesmen. Benevolent interpretation is certainly called for in the case of a politician who belonged to all parties and to none, who by personal influences rather than upon grounds of principle attained the highest position in the state, and who, when he fell, fell never to rise again, having failed even to command the loyalty of a personal following. The author is not positively enamoured of the subject; no one could be. His volume is a constant plea of extenuating circumstances, a not unnatural attitude for the biographer of a man who, apart from politics, had a human and pleasing side to his character.

In estimating Harley as a political force the personality of Anne has to be taken into account. Who really governed England during the successive periods of her reign? Was it the duchess of Marlborough, or Lady Masham, or Harley, or the queen herself? Clearly, if the last, the importance of Harley is reduced to that of a mere placeman. Mr. Roscoe in one part of his book follows a recent tendency to ascribe to Anne an

individuality of will which operated as a 'powerful factor' in the evolution of politics. Consistently with this view he concludes that 'in following the fortunes of the statesmen of the age of Anne personal contests and court intrigues have been too much considered' (p. 42). The examples of Anne's independence usually relied upon are her appointment of two high-church bishops in 1707 without consulting the ministry, the nomination of the duke of Shrewsbury in place of the marquess of Kent as lord chamberlain in April 1710, and the dismissal of Sunderland. Mr. Roscoe is probably quite right in saying that, in the case of the appointment of the bishops, 'considered at the time by the whigs as certain evidence of Harley's influence with the queen, there is not the smallest doubt that she acted entirely on her own opinion.' He is a little chary of citing authorities, or he might have supported this conclusion by the letter of Godolphin to the duke of Marlborough of 27 June 1707. But this appointment is of the nature of the exception which proves the rule, for Anne admittedly entertained strong high-church sentiments. It is true that the queen disliked Sunderland, but so did Harley, and Mr. Roscoe notes that his fall was a personal satisfaction to Harley as well as to the queen. The duke of Shrewsbury was the statesman whose turn of mind and political career most nearly resembled Harley's, and we know from Lord Raby, a contemporary diplomatist, that it was Harley who recommended him to the queen. When we come to the dismissal of Harley himself, Mr. Roscoe tells us truly that Lady Masham's influence 'was the final factor in Harley's fall, as it was in his rise to supreme power' (p. 165). Elsewhere (p. 170) he says, 'Like Godolphin his (Harley's) political life was finally destroyed by Lady Masham.' When two out of three of the prime ministers of the reign, to adopt the anachronism of the title-page, admittedly succumbed to the hostile influence of a woman of the bedchamber, can it be said with accuracy that 'personal contests and court intrigues have been too much considered'? It was through the effectiveness of his intrigues that Harley became a political force. He had the talent of selecting agents, and he would scarcely have agreed with Mr. Roscoe in calling Lady Masham 'an ordinary woman' (p. 95). The epithet 'straightforward' applied to her (p. 96) is still more astonishing and scarcely harmonises with the description of her 'influence veiled under the attractive guise of friendship' (p. 165). On the other hand the affection of Lady Masham towards the queen, like that of the duchess of Marlborough, was 'often tinged with something akin to contempt' (p. 95). Such an attitude on the part of the two people who knew the queen best was not likely to be assumed by two discerning politicians towards a personality which was a 'powerful factor' in political evolution. And if contemporaries can judge of the causes determining current events it is impossible to overlook the dominant place in men's minds and in the discussions of Godolphin's ministry occupied by bedchamber influence.

The fact is that Anne's predilections were personal rather than political. She had, before Lady Masham became powerful, a personal affection for Marlborough and Godolphin. She liked Somers, though he led the junta, because he was ceremonious. She would have hated Sunderland, even if he had been a tory, because he was brusque and

overbearing. She equally disliked the profligacy of Wharton and St. John, and they were of opposite politics. Cowper was a whig, yet he so won her heart that she thrice replaced the seals in his hands on his resignation in 1710. Lastly, the reasons alleged by her for the dismissal of Sunderland, Godolphin, and Harley were the same: they had been guilty of personal disrespect. Harley, as an acute observer, played up to her idiosyncrasy. In this sense there is something to be said for the proposition that he 'never attempted to form a middle party' (p. 43), that is, a party with definite political principles. St. John's personal claims were too powerful to be overlooked, but Harley's ministry in general, as the case of Cowper showed, was to be composed of members personally acceptable to the queen. What Harley did was to form a group of dependents who at first acted as a new 'flying squadron' and subsequently settled down into a ministerial party. But since he could only recruit from the two great parties and was by nature, as Mr. Roscoe justly insists, a man of moderation, his party became in effect a middle party. Neither is the author's dictum easily reconcilable with his suggestion that Harley, in opposing the Peerage Bill of 1719, 'might not be without hope that . . . a union of dissatisfied whigs with the tories might place him in power' (p. 192). Certainly he could never look for systematic support from the extremists of either party. As a matter of fact his supporters were tories. What ruined Harley was his character. Nobody trusted him. His passion for intrigue was the subject of pasquinades before Anne's accession. Marlborough, who rarely gave rein to his feelings, wrote of him to the queen as 'false and treacherous' in his proceedings. Mr. Roscoe rather fails to emphasise this determining factor of his nature. Though he says that after 1713 Harley involved himself in nothing less than a 'tissue of duplicity,' he adds, 'yet the foundation of it all was his desire to act on principles of moderation.' At any rate, as he admits, 'whigs and Hanoverians, tories and Jacobites alike had doubts of his good faith' (p. 155).

The early part of Harley's career might have been given us in more detail, especially if the author had followed the accounts of parliamentary proceedings by the foreign residents, with whose despatches Carl von Noorden has familiarised us. For instance, his first appointment as secretary of state in May 1704 receives little more than incidental mention, though if L'Hermitage is to be believed it was the outcome of an undertaking by Harley to bring over to Godolphin and Marlborough a certain number of tory supporters. Harley's conduct as speaker in the great constitutional struggle known as the Aylesbury case is also passed over, although it is a good example of that moderation of temper which the author claims for him. The social and literary sides of the man are well depicted. His manners seem to have been as varied as his politics. According to his biographer in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, they were 'cold and formal.' The queen declared that he 'behaved himself toward her with bad manners, indecency, and disrespect' (p. 167). On the other hand the author speaks of 'the ease and courtesy of Harley's manner' (p. 27). There is authority for all these views. Similarly it was, as Mr. Roscoe reminds us, his capacity for business that elevated him to the speaker-

ship of the house of commons; but the queen declared 'he neglected all business' (p. 167). It may be confidently inferred, and the Greg episode leads to the same conclusion, that perpetual engrossment in intrigue did not leave him much leisure for the duties of his department. The book is an interesting contribution towards the life of a unique personality. I. S. LEADAM.

Arnold's March from Cambridge to Quebec. By JUSTIN H. SMITH. (New York: Putnam. 1903.)

THE interest of this book is not strategic, but geographical. Arnold's march was part of a combined movement for the conquest of Canada. Whilst he was struggling through the wilderness out of the Kennebec valley into that of the Chaudière a larger force was also moving towards Quebec by an easier but longer route—by the Lakes and Montreal. The author might have treated the subject from a military point of view, and have asked whether the Americans were wise in dividing their forces and adopting two distinct lines of invasion. He might have examined the causes of the failure of a plan which promised far-reaching results and seemed to hold out reasonable prospects of success. But he has not adopted this mode of treatment. Instead he invites the reader to follow the progress of an adventurous expedition through a wilderness, traces the successive steps of its advance, weighs in the balance the different views of the route followed, and terminates his narrative somewhat abruptly when he has brought the little army to the north bank of the St. Lawrence, in sight of its goal.

The idea of utilising the valleys of the Kennebec and Chaudière for military purposes was no new one. It had been suggested by Frenchmen at the end of the seventeenth century. It had been talked of by Englishmen during the Seven Years' War. Early in 1775 apprehension was felt both in Maine and Quebec lest an invasion should be attempted by either combatant along this line. A good deal was already known vaguely about this route from the reports of Indians, hunters, missionaries, and surveyors. Montresor, an English engineer officer, had been despatched in 1761 to explore this region, and had produced a map and journal, both of which were used by Arnold. But though the route was thought to be available for an armed force it was reserved for Arnold to be the first to make the attempt and to demonstrate that it was just practicable, but attended with enormous difficulties. But he encountered no resistance from the enemy till he reached the St. Lawrence. The only obstacles which he had to face were those which nature placed in his path, and in the light of his experience the English government abstained from attempting a counter-invasion on this line. Washington entirely underestimated the difficulties of the march. He writes to the Continental Congress on 21 Sept. 1775, 'I made all possible inquiry as to the distance, the safety of the route, and the danger of the season being too far advanced, but found nothing in either to deter me from proceeding.' The event proved that the lateness of the season was a very serious obstacle. The first order for the expedition was issued on 5 Sept., but it took time to equip the troops for the march, and they did not begin to leave Cambridge till the 11th. Their total strength was 'almost exactly

1,050,' but neither artillery nor heavy baggage accompanied the expedition; the information available made it plain that troops so encumbered would have no chance of success.

The author has vividly described the difficulties of the march. These may be said to have commenced when the army reached the Dead River. Early on 22 Oct. the river rose suddenly in flood, submerging some of the camps and temporarily obliterating the landmarks. On the 25th the 4th division turned its back on the other three and started homeward, taking with it the reserve supplies. Enos, its commander, was tried by court-martial on his return to Cambridge and 'honourably acquitted,' but the verdict has but little value, as the only evidence available at the time was that of his own officers. Very possibly Enos's defection was the cause of the expedition's failure. The hardest task for the historian is to trace the course followed by Arnold from the Upper Dead River over the 'height of land' to Lake Megantic, whence issued the Chaudière. The evidence is conflicting and various hypotheses have been suggested. The author closely follows Arnold's journal, 'apparently written day by day or not long after the events,' which he finds agrees reasonably closely with Montresor's map and his own experience. He has been at great pains to ascertain the exact truth, having himself crossed the 'height of land' seven times. Arnold with an advance party was somewhat ahead of the rest of the expedition, and it is not certain that all the divisions took the same route, but the probability is that they followed in Arnold's steps. The greatest difficulties encountered were during the march round Lake Megantic, where almost the whole expedition was in danger of 'complete extinction,' whilst the attempt to descend the Upper Chaudière, a feat which no boatman of the present day would undertake, proved fatal to the remaining *bateaux*. Of the 220 with which the expedition started only a very few were carried over the long portage, estimated to be from four and a half to six miles across the 'height of land.'

It is an interesting question how far the expedition was in danger of starvation. That danger was probably aggravated by Enos's retreat, and some of the narratives give a piteous description of the privations of certain troops. The author reckons that with proper care the army should never have been on less than half-rations, but it was impossible to persuade the men to husband their stock of food, and his conclusion is, 'There is ample evidence of hunger to the verge of starvation: only we must not think of every soldier as undergoing this extreme suffering.' The only journal which goes into detail on this point estimates the loss in the wilderness at from seventy to eighty. But that figure is questionable, since the writer of the journal overestimates the original strength of the expedition, and underestimates the numbers of the force with which Arnold crossed the St. Lawrence on 13 and 14 Nov. Arnold himself in an official report states his force before Quebec at 675, which exceeds the estimate of the journal by 165. W. B. Wood.

Mémoires du Général-Major Russe Baron de Löwenstern (1776–1858). Annotés par M. H. Weil. 2 vols. (Paris: Fontemoing. 1903.)

As the number of memoirs of Russian soldiers and statesmen is comparatively small, a welcome may be accorded to all that deal with this

great period of their history. Löwenstern's memoirs take the form of notes, jotted down in a simple easy style, concerning the events in which he took part. Unfortunately they were written down, as is shown in the 'Avant-Propos,' as late as the years 1842–50. Interrupted for a time by the command of the emperor Nicholas I that they should be sent to him, Löwenstern nevertheless resumed his task, as he recorded in private letters of that period. He also drew up a French version; but, although a Parisian publisher offered a large sum for his manuscript, he decided to keep it in the family. This manuscript M. Weil has now edited.

The charm of these *Mémoires* is their naturalness. The writer modestly says—

> Tout le monde peut écrire des mémoires; on n'a qu'à vivre longtemps. Les faits arrivent d'eux-mêmes; l'habitude de l'observation, de l'investigation, de la critique se gagne: mais peu de personnes se donnent cette peine.

He also claims to have told nothing but the truth. The remark is not without parallel. But we note, as showing the bent of his mind, a sentence in a private letter of 1853: *Dieu, Alexandre, la nation et Koutouzoff ont sauvé l'empire lors de l'invasion des Français en* 1812. Those who remember Kutusoff's conduct during the pursuit will find that sentence significant; and it scarcely accords with the writer's own criticisms of the prince's actions at that time. There is little of interest in Löwenstern's early career. For a short space of time he served under Suvòroff, whose character and genius he depicts in the most glowing terms. Not content with extolling his magnanimity and humanity in war, he claims that *il était sans contredit le plus grand capitaine de son siècle, toujours victorieux, jamais vaincu.* The statement and its justification alike show that age had not brought moderation to Löwenstern. For Korsakoff, who fared so badly at Masséna's hands at Zürich, the writer has nothing but censure. He was *fat, arrogant, présomptueux. . . . Il portait en lui-même le principe de sa défaite. Il s'était placé dans une telle situation que Masséna était forcé de le vaincre.* Either Löwenstern did not know or he passed over in silence the difficulties in which Korsakoff was involved by the almost complete withdrawal of his Austrian allies, and by the need of struggling on, so as to lighten the pressure of the French on Suvòroff on his march northwards from the St. Gothard. The editor should here have added a note qualifying Löwenstern's very one-sided remarks. The young Russian had some share in the operations intended to cover Korsakoff's retreat; but this did not qualify him to pass judgment on the Swiss campaign as a whole.

On his marriage Löwenstern determined to leave the army, but after the death of his wife in 1809 at Vienna he asked permission to take service in Napoleon's army as a volunteer; it was granted. He therefore took part in the campaign of that year; but his descriptions lack the clearness and fulness of detail that lend value to memoirs. He accuses the Austrians of losing a great opportunity after Aspern, owing to *tiédeur et hésitation*; but apparently he knew little of the practical difficulties that then faced them. He likewise exaggerates the weakness of the French after that defeat. The description of Napoleon at Wagram is more detailed: the manner in which the staff was managed by Berthier and Duroc, Napoleon's picking nosegays and destroying them

during the fight on the evening before the great battle, his loud call for the artillery of the guard on hearing of the success of Davoust's turning movement, and his falling asleep on a piece of carpet stretched out for him by his Mameluke after the battle—all this has the sharpness of outline always to be desired. The same may be said of the account of the stampede of the French camp-followers and reserves on the approach of the archduke John's army in the evening. Clearly, from Löwenstern's account, the panic seized no small part of the victorious army and produced the wildest confusion. Two generals finally fired cannon on the fugitives and brought them to a stop. Among these cannon Löwenstern states that there were some Portuguese guns and gunners. He probably meant Spaniards. At a later time, when describing this panic to the emperor Alexander, he was expressly forbidden to speak about it in St. Petersburg.

Löwenstern's pages show the license and extravagance of Russian society at that time. He describes the war of 1812 as popular, for every Russian of spirit felt degraded by the last five years of subservience to Napoleon. During the war Löwenstern was closely attached to Barclay's staff, and entrusted with a message to Murat, of whom, as of Sébastiani, he gives a lifelike account. In fact as a rule the sketches of men in these volumes are far better than those of battles and events; the latter are of little worth; but the notes respecting Barclay, Bagration, Toll, Rostopchin, and many others are distinctly valuable. Löwenstern suffered disgrace for a time owing to suspicions that he had given news to the French; and while under surveillance at Moscow he saw another officer arrive from the main army with despatches, only to be forthwith arrested and sent to Perm. Löwenstern, however, was reinstated and returned to the front shortly before the battle of Borodino, when Barclay, *le Fabius moderne*, was about to be replaced by Kutusoff. He states that Barclay, though convinced of the soundness of his strategy, was glad to be relieved of the enormous responsibility that weighed on him. In the battle Löwenstern led on a battalion of the Tomsk regiment to recapture (for the first time, as it proved) the Rajeffsky redoubt, and succeeded in driving out the enemy with the bayonet. Shortly afterwards he was wounded twice in quick succession, but refused to go to the rear. He heard Barclay say that he intended to press for the employment of a mass of cavalry from the Russian right, and that that move would be decisive if made with vigour, but that if Bennigsen were entrusted with it his jealousy would paralyse everything. In point of fact that charge was not made with energy, a fault for which Löwenstern held General Ouvaroff to be guilty. All the same he pronounced the battle, 'if not gained, certainly not lost,' and as being terminated by *un épais brouillard*! Löwenstern throws no light on the vexed question of the origin of the fires of Moscow; but his account of Murat's defeat at Tarutino is detailed and graphic: the conception of that affair he ascribes to Bennigsen and Toll, while he says that Kutusoff's sluggishness made the success less decisive than it might have been. The account of the French retreat and of the affairs at Viasma and Krasnoë and the Beresina is, on the whole, disappointing. At the last place he blames Wittgenstein for giving too much attention to Victor's corps and thus letting Napoleon and the main

body escape. He says that the Russians had fully expected to capture the French emperor and his army there. The division of General Partouneaux, which had to lay down its arms, was found to be in good condition, far different from that of the French army as a whole. The Russians were also in a miserable state: *le froid rend les soldats pusillanimes*; once in a well-warmed cottage there was no moving them on.

We have no space in which to follow Löwenstern through his notes of the second volume, on the campaigns of 1813 and 1814. The parts which best repay perusal are those which deal with the capture of Soissons, in which he played an important part, or the sanguinary fight of La Fère Champenoise. In method and style the memoirs recall those of Von Boyen; but, except for their portraits of men and sketches of society, they are of less merit. J. HOLLAND ROSE.

Marengo. Von Dr. ALFRED HERRMANN. (Münster: Aschendorff. 1903.)

THE study of the military events of 1800 has been made much easier of late years by the appearance of two very important collections of materials—that of M. de Cugnac [1] from the French archives and that of Professor Hüffer.[2] But though the work now under review owes a great deal to these collections, and was to a certain extent suggested by their appearance,[3] it has a considerable independent value. Dr. Herrmann has not only made excellent use of these materials and of the other published sources; he has himself searched the archives at Vienna, and is able to add several important documents to those included in Dr. Hüffer's work. The result is a most useful contribution to military literature. The problems connected with the battle of Marengo are clearly stated and sanely discussed without unnecessary minuteness. The evidence is handled with a judicious impartiality. The criticisms are severe, but for the most part well deserved. The narrative is forcible and interesting, and the whole work is obviously the result of great knowledge of the subject and careful study, and it is to be hoped that Dr. Herrmann may carry out his project of writing the history of the whole war of 1800.

The opening chapters deal with the French and Austrian armies in 1800. These are very useful, though possibly rather too much is made of the defects in the French organisation and administration;—indeed, the author almost admits as much himself later on (p. 231). Then the French plan of campaign is sketched, and an account is given of the movements of the two armies down to the eventful 14 June. This part of the work might with advantage have been made a little longer, and hardly enough attention is given to the great effect of the appearance on the Italian theatre of action of the troops under Moncey detached from the French army in Germany. The actual battle of Marengo teems with contentious points, both of tactics and of evidence, which could only be adequately discussed in some detail, so that it is impossible here

[1] *Campagne de l'Armée de Réserve en* 1800 (Paris, 1900–1).

[2] *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kriegs von* 1800 (Leipzig, 1901); see the *English Historical Review*, April, 1904.

[3] Cf. Preface, p. v.

to go into all the points raised by Dr. Herrmann's account. As to the net results it may be sufficient to say that he shows plainly what a very 'near run thing' (to use the duke of Wellington's phrase[4]) the battle was, and how much Napoleon owed to Desaix and Kellermann, whose initiative and energy extricated him from a very critical predicament, and turned apparently a hopelessly lost action into a complete victory. That the decisive stroke was Kellermann's charge, undertaken on his own initiative and responsibility, is clear. Desaix's resistance had checked the Austrian advance, and so gave the cavalry their opportunity, but his division were themselves wavering and the Austrians were all but in among Marmont's guns (p. 183) when Kellermann came crashing in upon their flank.

On the convention of Alessandria Dr. Herrmann has a most interesting chapter. He would apparently agree with Count Neipperg's description of it as 'dictated by arrogance and accepted by pusillanimity.' He is certainly most emphatic in pronouncing it absolutely unnecessary. The situation of the Austrian army was, on his showing, far from hopeless, nor were the French in a position to justify their expecting such a sequel to their Pyrrhic victory. That Melas was bluffed into capitulating is to Dr. Herrmann the most convincing proof of the veteran general's unfitness for his high command and the worst of all his many errors. Dr. Herrmann, it may be noticed, does not seem to share the general tendency to make the unpopular Zach the scapegoat for all the shortcomings of the Austrian army. Dr. Herrmann is strongly of opinion that even after Marengo it would have been possible for Melas to do what he should have done on June 14 instead of fighting, namely, to escape by the inadequately guarded line of retreat down the left bank of the Po. He dismisses with hardly sufficient consideration the alternative line of retreat by the Bochetta Pass to Genoa, where Lord Keith and the English fleet would have provided their allies with a safe way of escape; he does not seem to realise the full possibilities of the English command of the sea. He is evidently enamoured of the idea of a dash down the left bank of the Po, and, even if a little over-sanguine in his estimate of the chances of success, still adduces good reasons for his contention that it was quite practicable and that Napoleon could not have stopped it. But there was an element of the incalculable in Napoleon which Dr. Herrmann seems rather to have overlooked. True, he had not been at his best at Marengo, but what was impossible to a lesser man was not as a rule impossible to him. Moreover, such an effort required something which was not to be found in Alessandria on 15 June 1800—energy and resolution in the Austrian commander. And we cannot but think that Dr. Herrmann has neglected to give full consideration to the very definite statements as to the unprovided condition of the fortresses of Piedmont.[5] The most striking feature about the whole work is the relative insignificance of Napoleon. Momentous as was the effect of Marengo on his subsequent career—for it was not military success only for which he was indebted to Kellermann and Desaix—of all Napoleon's great victories Marengo was probably the success to which he himself contributed least. But possibly Dr. Herrmann has unduly minimised Napoleon's share; for he seems to have a

[4] *Creevey Papers*, i. 236.

[5] Cf. Hüffer, *op. cit.* p. 355.

slight tendency to overthrow the received version wherever he can just for the sake of doing so.

A very complete bibliography deserves mention. The two maps repeat rather than supplement each other; the second should certainly show more of the whole theatre of the campaign. C. T. Atkinson.

Le Général Fabvier: sa vie militaire et politique. Par A. Debidour. (Paris: Plon. 1904.)

The career of General Fabvier certainly deserved a monograph, and the present volume, based on his private papers, on a number of documents in the collection of the Ἱστορικὴ καὶ Ἐθνολογικὴ Ἑταιρεία of Athens, and on various printed sources, gives an unbiassed and unvarnished account of his romantic life. A soldier of Napoleon I, a conspirator, a Philhellene, and a peer of France, Fabvier played many parts, and if he was not always successful, his participation in the Greek War of Independence, which is the main incident in this biography, has secured him an honourable place in the history of that movement. Fabvier gained his first experience of the Near East during the French occupation of Dalmatia, and he gives in one of his letters an amusing account of Ragusan society in the last years of that ancient republic's existence. In 1823 he arrived in Greece, put Navarino into a state of defence, and, after a year of obscure work, left the country, but returned in 1825. He became chief of the τακτικὸν σῶμα, and, by learning the language and wearing the costume, gained considerable influence over the Greeks. Unfortunately, he was an intractable man, 'notoriously deficient,' as Finlay said, 'in temper and prudence;' his jealousy of the English in general, and of Sir Richard Church in particular, knew no bounds; he quarrelled with Karaiskákes, and he loathed Capo d'Istria, whom he regarded as a Russian agent. He was accordingly ordered to leave Greece in 1829. At the same time, he rendered an immense service to the cause by enabling the Greeks to hold out so long as they did in the Akropolis, and this should be set against the unfortunate expedition to Chîos and his failure to take Kárystos. He considered, not without reason, that the character of the modern Greeks resembled that of the ancients, but his plan for settling the Eastern question and checkmating Russia by creating a great Greece, which should include Epiros and Macedonia, left out the important factor of the Balkan Slavs. After his departure from Greece he wrote a pamphlet on this text; he corresponded with Kolettes, and remained a firm friend of Hellenism to the last. He disapproved of Otho's appointment, and thought that Greece should first be pacified and organised by himself, and then handed over to a French prince.

His biographer has made a few errors from lack of local knowledge. Thus the monastery of Daphní can scarcely be called the *point dominant de la chaîne*; Chasiá is not north-east of Athens; the Orthodox calendar is not now '12 days behind the Gregorian;' mistakes in Greek occur on pp. 270, *n.* 2, and 371; and 'Vostitza' should be read on p. 334. In recording the gratitude of the Greeks to his hero, the author omits to mention the little white marble tablet let into the Odeîon of Heródes

Atticus, which commemorates his defence of the Akropolis. He also ignores the fact, recently demonstrated by a Greek writing in the *Néon Asty*, that Fabvier owed his first interest in Greece to his Greek fellow-student in Paris, Dorótheos Próios, afterwards murdered with the patriarch Gregory V at Constantinople. The volume contains an excellent portrait and a full bibliography. W. MILLER.

A History of the Greenbacks, with Special Reference to the Economic Consequences of their Issue, 1862–5. By WESLEY CLAIR MITCHELL. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1903.)

IN this book a pattern is supplied of the way in which economic history should be written. Its plan is so plain and simple that the reader is enabled to make his way by easy stages through a mass of complicated facts, and rises from the perusal of the successive chapters with a sharp impression graven on his mind of the reasons and results of the elaborate inquiry through which he has been induced to travel. Nor is this satisfactory conclusion gained by any lack of industry in the search for original material, by any lazy reluctance to probe to the bottom the significance of every particle of relevant evidence that can be produced or found, or by any perverting anxiety to prove a special thesis. On the contrary we doubt whether the important if limited period of economic history comprised within the book will ever be subjected to a more diligent, thorough, or candid examination than that which it has here received. In some respects, no doubt, the author is favoured by the nature of the particular task essayed; for the narrative occupies the brief space of a few isolated years, and the phenomena described do not extend beyond the operations and results of a single conspicuous cause. But, on the other hand, the difficulty of disentangling its effects from those of other causes with which they are intermingled is so arduous that we feel admiration for the skill of the craftsman rather than envy of the work undertaken. A broad generalisation, resting on the large movement of economic tendencies through a considerable space of time, is, of course, rendered impossible in this case by the nature of the problem to be solved. But although the range of observation is reduced to manageable limits the facts necessary to a right judgment are not easy to discover, and are even less easy to interpret accurately when they have been found. The book furnishes, indeed, a lesson in statistical method as well as a model of economic history. We can see how incumbent it is on the statistician to prepare himself by long and patient training for the business of wresting from unwilling figures the truths they are reluctant to surrender. This last consideration leads us to call attention in conclusion to one other qualification which the author of this book possesses for successful work in economic history. He is an acute observer and he is familiar with statistical technique. But he also exhibits an acquaintance with economic theory. We are sure that without such assistance it would have been hopeless to endeavour to penetrate the mazes of the perplexing tangle which surrounds the issues of the greenbacks during the American civil war.

The book consists of three parts. In the first the history of the

Legal Tender Acts is given; in the second the economic consequences of the acts are shown; and in the third the statistical material on which the reasoning is based is presented in detail. The history is marked by exact impartiality. The actual position of the government before the expedient of inconvertible paper was adopted is examined, the leading arguments of the debaters in congress on the measure are cited and reviewed, and the real motives and alleged reasons for the successive steps taken by the responsible authorities are produced and scrutinised. In the second part, which deals with the economic consequences of the issues, the author's quality is more conspicuously displayed, and the history narrated in the first part may be considered a necessary preface rather than the real substance of the book.

The effects of the greenbacks on the circulating medium are investigated in an early chapter. We realise here how complicated the American currency was at this as at other times, and we note that the inconvertible paper did not merely, as we might have supposed, drive the gold and silver money from the country, but that, as its value sank, further inconveniences arose in connexion with the minor coins and the fractional currency. Nor were the other forms of paper money simultaneously in circulation, which in some cases had been issued previously and in others were emitted subsequently to the greenbacks themselves, unaffected in certain curious ways. The specie value of the greenbacks forms the subject of the next chapter, and the rare ability of the author is here shown in the combined pains and skill with which the different factors affecting the gold price of the paper are separated and appraised. The course of the depreciation is traced during the four years covered by the volume; and we see how vicissitudes in the fortunes of the war and changes in the condition of the finances left their impress on the value of the greenbacks. In the fourth chapter the actual movement of prices is subjected to the most diligent and discriminating scrutiny, with the result that sufficient evidence is forthcoming to demonstrate the predominant influence of the paper issues. But the attentive reader will admire the dexterity with which the defective material alone available is improved into a form in which it can be treated as a basis for legitimate deduction, and he will appreciate the scrupulous anxiety shown not to press conclusions further than they can be taken without straining the reasoning by which they are obtained. In the succeeding chapters the effects of the paper currency on wages, rent, interest, and profits, and on production and consumption generally are discussed. In many of these cases the statistics are scanty and inadequate, and even when they exist in sufficient quantity and tolerable quality they are not easy to interpret. But our author is not readily discouraged or deterred. With remarkable skill results are reached which are no less instructive than they seem to be trustworthy. That wages failed to rise as fast as prices, that rents and interest were adversely influenced, and that the 'residual claimants,' who might be regarded as receiving profits, derived an advantage which was not freed from counteracting loss, are some of the broad deductions yielded by the evidence. A stimulus to production was, no doubt, supplied, although even on this point the evidence does not tend uniformly in one direction; and similarly if the consumption

of some classes was increased that of others was diminished. Finally, the effects of the issues of the greenbacks on the finances of the government itself are investigated in the concluding chapter, which, like the rest of this book, exhibits the scrupulous anxiety of a judicial mind not to exaggerate or underestimate the meaning of such actual facts as can be ascertained.

That the greenbacks were the outcome of a pressing emergency which could not have been met by any other expedient that would not have produced a worse result, is not the opinion of the author of this book. Nor is it shown that on the balance the finances of the government were otherwise than injured by a recourse to inconvertible paper, while the consequences to the community as a whole were probably more disadvantageous than beneficial. But none the less care is taken to attach due weight to opposing considerations, and the reader is supplied with material for forming a judgment of his own and with the necessary implements for accomplishing this arduous undertaking. We believe that the book will take a permanent place as an able conscientious contribution to American economic history. The monetary student in other countries will derive from its perusal the rare advantage, seldom secured from economic study, of observing the ascertained results of a practical experiment, separated so far as circumstances admit from their surroundings. He is enabled to measure the degree in which theory is or is not confirmed by fact. He can appreciate the aid which statistics, skilfully and fairly used, can render to the solution of an intricate economic problem. L. L. PRICE.

Jules Ferry. Par ALFRED RAMBAUD. (Paris: Plon. 1903.)

M. RAMBAUD relates the public life of one of the most courageous, clear-sighted, and disinterested of French statesmen with the skill of a practised historian and the special knowledge of a friend and official subordinate, for he was at one time the *chef de cabinet* of M. Jules Ferry. The history of Jules Ferry's career is the history of the foundation of the French republic, of a republic no longer distrusted by the rural classes as the reign of restless adventure and agitation. No man was the object of more virulent abuse during his lifetime. Before his death the prejudices with which the rancour of his opponents and the misrepresentations of an unscrupulous press had inspired too many of his fellow-citizens were indeed beginning to yield to a more just appreciation of his services; but how great those services were has even now scarcely been realised by his countrymen, and still less by foreigners. M. Rambaud's most interesting book is likely, therefore, to raise the reputation of his friend, as well as to be a valuable contribution to the history of the latter part of the nineteenth century. It would have been strange had Jules Ferry been very popular. He had neither the arts of a demagogue nor that sympathy with public feeling by which some statesmen are half unconsciously led to adapt their policy to the wishes of the multitude. A liberal and a republican by conviction, he was essentially a man of order, opposed to extreme courses, hating intolerance and oppression when exercised by the will of the sovereign people not less than by the arbitrary caprice of a despot.

M. Rambaud has well brought out the most salient points in the career of Ferry and the essential principles of his policy. He entered upon public life as one of the small band who first in the press and afterwards in the chamber of deputies organised the opposition to the second empire. As mayor of Paris during the terrible days of the siege his intrepid self-possession and resourcefulness prevented the triumph of the *communards* on 31 Oct.—in other words, the establishment of a government in the capital hostile to the rest of the country and the consequent paralysis of all further resistance to the invaders. Nor should it be forgotten that if Thiers in March 1871 had listened to Ferry's protest against the withdrawal of the garrisons from the forts, and to his offer, if a few hundred troops were put at his disposal, to hold the hôtel de ville and the neighbouring buildings for an indefinite time against the rioters, the second siege of Paris would, even if not altogether averted, have contributed a less tragic and blood-stained page to the annals of France. The greatest and most permanent benefit which Jules Ferry conferred on his country was, no doubt, the organisation of the national education on broad and liberal lines: yet the colonial empire which he founded would by itself be a sufficient title to the reputation of a great statesman and to the gratitude of France. And in both cases he pursued the policy which he believed to be the wisest, unbiassed by ambition or by any regard for personal popularity. By attempting to carry a clause forbidding the members of unauthorised congregations to teach, and when this was rejected by putting the law in force against the Jesuits and other illegal religious associations, he excited the formidable and lasting hostility of the clerical party, while his determination to respect all religious convictions, to prevent a secularist propaganda and the conversion of every schoolmaster into an *anti-curé* alienated much liberal support. So also his colonial policy was far from popular. The people hated expeditions which exposed their children to perish in inglorious skirmishes or pestilential swamps. The radicals were averse to all schemes of colonial expansion, although the necessary corollary of the protectionist policy approved by the electorate. The conservatives bitterly criticised, even when at heart they approved, the policy of 'the persecutor of the church.' It was a specious cry that while the Mekong was being conquered the Rhine was forgotten. *Le Tonkinois*, *le Tunisien* were terms of bitter reproach, although now, when France is so proud of her new colonies, they might seem titles scarcely less honourable than the Africanus or the Asiaticus of a Roman proconsul. Perhaps the most flattering testimony to the patriotic insight and energy of Ferry may be found in the frantic efforts of all mischievous and selfish factions to prevent his election as president. Jacobins and ultramontanes, Bonapartists, Orleanists, and followers of the 'music-hall Saint-Arnauld' took counsel together to prevent the elevation of the man who more than any other had given to republican institutions the stability and moderation which disarmed the suspicion of *bourgeoisie* and peasants.

M. Rambaud has performed his task with great judgment, and he has by extracts from speeches and correspondence made the statesman to a great extent the exponent of his own views and policy. He has touched on his private life only slightly and with delicate reticence, yet he has

lifted the veil just enough to enable the reader to see that Jules Ferry, when among his family and his friends, possessed that sympathetic amiability in which as a public man he was perhaps wanting. M. Rambaud justly emphasises the fact that, although a consistent liberal, Ferry was, as has already been said, far from being a radical or a Jacobin. He desired a strong and influential senate, and a chamber of deputies composed not of delegates but of representatives; he believed the 'masses' to be more ignorant of their own interests and not less selfish than the 'classes,' and he was convinced that it was the duty of a statesman not to flatter and follow but to educate and guide the people. The study of the career of such a man is as interesting as it is profitable, and it is well that the task of describing that career should have fallen into hands so capable. P. F. WILLERT.

A History of Northumberland. Vols. VI. and VII. By JOHN CRAWFORD HODGSON, F.S.A. (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Andrew Reid & Co. 1902, 1904.)

UNDER the guidance of the Northumberland County History Committee the history of that county is being written on a scale more extensive than has been attempted for any other English county. The work was really begun so long ago as 1820, when an industrious northern antiquary, the Rev. John Hodgson, published the first volume of his well planned but never finished history. Between that date and 1840 he issued three quarto volumes of records relating to Northumberland from public and private sources, including the Pipe Rolls from 1130 to 1272, and three similarly sized volumes of parish history of parts of the county, the last of which contained his valuable treatise on the Roman Wall. To these a further volume, treating of the general history of the county, was added in 1858 by Mr. Hodgson Hinde. The parish history commenced by John Hodgson had only covered one-fourth of the entire area of the county, and the work remained in this incomplete state until 1890. In that year Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, at a meeting of the Newcastle Society of Antiquaries, suggested that the work should be proceeded with, and that the history of the entire county should be rewritten on the lines laid down by John Hodgson. The suggestion was favourably received; a committee was formed, a guarantee fund raised, and upwards of 700 subscribers were obtained for the publication. Under these favourable auspices seven further volumes of parish history have been issued, each containing about 500 quarto pages of printed matter, with numerous plates and other illustrations. Vols. i. and ii. of this new issue were edited by Mr. Edward Bateson, vol. iii. by Mr. Allen B. Hinds, and vols. iv., v., vi., and vii. by Mr. John Crawford Hodgson. The first five volumes relate to Bamburgh, Warkworth, Hexhamshire, and other districts. Of vols. vi. and vii., now under review, the one treats of the parishes of Bywell St. Peter and Bywell St. Andrew, with the chapelry of Slaley, and the other covers the parishes of Edlingham and Felton, and the chapelries of Bolton, Framlington, and Brinkburn. Whilst, in the south of England, parishes and townships are for the most part conterminous, this is not the case in the northern counties, where the ancient parish generally

includes many townships, a fact which was recognised by the statute 14 Charles II, c. 12. The volumes therefore include larger areas than their titles indicate. For instance, vol. vi. comprises the history of twenty-one townships and vol. vii. of fifteen. The annals of the parishes included in each volume, and of the townships comprised in them, have been carefully compiled by the editor, Mr. John Crawford Hodgson, who has taken his information from the record volumes for the county published by John Hodgson, from that historian's manuscript collections, placed at the disposal of the committee by his grandson Mr. John G. Hodgson, from the manuscript transcripts of Northumberland records at Alnwick Castle, from the charters in the Durham treasury, from the deeds of local landowners, from the publications of the Record Office, and from many other sources of authentic information.

The two Bywell parishes treated of in vol. vi. comprise the baronies of Baliol and Bolbeck, and to that volume Dr. Greenwell has contributed a very complete account of the kingly family of the Baliols, lords of the barony of that name. The account is illustrated by a facsimile charter and seal of Eustace de Baliol, granting the church of Bywell St. Peter to the convent of Durham, by a confirming charter and seal of Hugh de Baliol, and by reproductions of nine other Baliol seals from various sources. Vol. vi. also contains a description of Bywell Castle by the late Mr. C. J. Bates, the author of *Border Holds*, a history of the Premonstratensian priory of Blanchland by the editor, and pedigrees of Baliol, Neville, Darrayns, Menevill, Fenwick of Bywell, and many other Northumbrian families. Vol. vii. follows the same lines. The bulk of the volume is written by the editor, but Dr. Greenwell again adds a most valuable contribution. Edlingham was formerly part of the possessions of the Gospatrics, ultimately earls of Dunbar and March. Ninety pages of the volume are occupied by Dr. Greenwell's complete and exhaustive history of the great pre-Conquest house of Gospatric, and the account is illustrated by reproductions of many Gospatric charters and seals, and by an excellent pedigree from original sources of the Gospatric family. The volume also contains accounts of Edlingham Castle, Lemington Castle, Lemington Tower, and Brinkburn Priory, by the editor, assisted in architectural details by Mr. W. H. Knowles, and pedigrees of Acton, Bellingham, Carliol, Heselrigg, Lisle, Orde, Ogle, Swinburne, and many other families. Each volume contains a mine of information upon the subjects of local families, the Scottish wars, and north-country customs, and there are some references to the ancient tenure by drengage and to those peculiar north-country tenants who were known as 'self-odes.' The typography is good, and the volumes are well illustrated by maps of the districts, plans of the buildings, and by photo-engravings of old views and of modern photographs and original sketches of interesting and picturesque places. The four large volumes (vols. iv., v., vi., and vii.) so satisfactorily edited by Mr. John Crawford Hodgson will form a lasting memorial of that editor's gratuitously rendered ability and industry. The preparation of the next volume, which will include the history of Tynemouth Priory and Castle, has been entrusted to Mr. H. E. E. Craster. It was urged at the commencement

of the undertaking that the work should be preceded by the publication of additional records relating to the county. Though this proved impracticable, yet the course taken by John Hodgson, of first publishing the records so far as they were accessible in his day, was a wise one; and we will express a hope that in a work undertaken on so large a scale, and now being published once for all, no effort will be spared to make the preliminary searches complete and to utilise fully every available source of information. F. W. DENDY.

Verspreide Studien op het Gebied der Geschiedenis. Door P. J. BLOK. (Groningen: Wolters. 1908.)

THIS volume contains twelve studies contributed by Professor P. J. Blok to various periodicals between 1886 and 1901. They deal with a considerable variety of periods and subjects, and are written in Dr. Blok's well-known style, clear, practical, and judicious. The essay upon Frisian affairs in the middle ages treats with lucidity and knowledge a somewhat obscure subject, and will repay perusal. The account of the agriculture and manufactures of the Frisians, and their trade relations with England and the Hanseatic league, is interesting. To the student of the local and provincial history of the United Provinces the position and influence of the town of Groningen in relation to the surrounding district (*ommelanden*) has always been peculiar. The essay on the 'Council and Guilds of Groningen about 1525' (i.e. some forty years before the outbreak of the revolt) is therefore valuable in the light it throws upon the earlier political condition of the province known in the seventeenth century as *Stad en Landen*. The two studies entitled 'The Battle on Mookerheide' and 'John of Nassau' are reprints of addresses delivered at the inauguration of memorials to two of the brothers of William the Silent. These are rhetorical and popular in style, but give a spirited account of the part played by Louis of Nassau in the first campaigns of the revolt, and by John of Nassau in bringing about the union of Utrecht. The essay on the 'Religion of William of Orange' is a careful and, in the main, successful attempt to defend the prince against the charges of opportunism and insincerity so often brought against him in regard to his changes of religion. Dr. Blok certainly makes good his contention that William in his later years was a genuinely religious man and a convinced adherent of the reformed faith. No student, indeed, of the prince's correspondence with his near relatives can have any doubt on either of these points, for in these private letters the inner workings of the man's soul stand revealed. But, as Dr. Blok himself admits, William's well-known liberal and tolerant views were absolutely inconsistent with and opposed to the doctrines of strict Calvinism. If after 1573 the prince called himself a Calvinist, it can only have been with many reserves, and to some extent as a concession to political exigencies.

The sketch of the 'Official Life of Huygens' draws deserved attention to the remarkable career of a remarkable man. Constantine Huygens was private secretary and confidential adviser in succession to the three princes of Orange, Frederick Henry, William II, and William III. His

father, Christian, before him had been private secretary to William the Silent, and secretary to the council of state in the days of Maurice, to whom he was a trusted counsellor. His son Constantine the younger succeeded him as private secretary to William III. The subject of the present notice was a striking personality, a man of the most varied talents, and it is difficult to estimate the extent which his counsel and advice had for a period extending over sixty years in the direction of affairs, especially in the conduct of diplomatic relations with foreign powers. It is quite certain that it was very great, and that on many occasions his country was deeply indebted to his foresight, experience, and knowledge of affairs. Among other distinguished services it was he who arranged the preliminaries of the marriage between Frederick Henry's only son and the princess royal of England, and during the long minority of their son, William III, it was he who, as president of the prince's council, protected his interests and superintended his education at the side of, and often as intermediary between, the two princesses of Orange, his mother and grandmother. The name of Constantine Huygens is perhaps best known to posterity by the distinguished place that he occupies in the history of Dutch literature, but it is right that attention should be drawn to the far more solid, though less brilliant, service that he rendered during an official life which began in 1620 and continued almost without intermission until his death in 1687.

To myself, perhaps the most interesting study in Professor Blok's volume is that in which he gives an account of the life, the labours, and the critical methods of his distinguished predecessor in the chair of Dutch history in the University of Leyden. Of the merits of the late Professor Robert Fruin as an historian, and of the value of his contributions to the right understanding of the history of his country, Dr. Blok writes with an enthusiasm and a just appreciation which spring from intimate personal acquaintance with the man and a thorough knowledge of his writings and of the subject matter of which they treat. As a profound admirer of the late Professor Fruin's historical work, both as an original investigator and as a critic, I am glad to take this opportunity of adding my personal testimony to the correctness of this high estimate, which I do not consider to be in any way overdrawn. Robert Fruin's *Verspreide Geschriften*, which are now being published under the editorship of Dr. Blok himself, Mr. P. L. Muller, and Mr. S. Muller Fz, are invaluable to the student of Dutch history both from the variety of subjects with which they deal and from the thoroughness of the treatment. It will interest readers of this Review to know that Fruin's grandparents were English, and that the name was originally spelt Frewen or Frewin. An old house in Oxford, Frewin Hall, still records this family name. The grandfather of the Leyden professor was a paper manufacturer in Warwickshire, who settled at Rotterdam in the early part of the nineteenth century.

It seems needlessly confusing to speak, as Dr. Blok does (p. 133), of the first wife of William the Silent as Anna van Buren, instead of Anna van Egmont, the name by which she is ordinarily known. The expression *stadhouderlijke hof* (p. 197) is scarcely correct in 1667; at that time William III was not yet stadholder. It is to be regretted that the book has no index or table of contents.

GEORGE EDMUNDSON.

The sixth edition of Professor G. Maspero's *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient* (Paris: Hachette, 1904) contains a good deal of fresh material. Notice has been taken of the most recent discoveries and investigations, *e.g.* the code of Hammurabi, and little of importance has been overlooked. The illustrations with which the book abounds have been happily selected and are superior to those which usually adorn popular works of this kind. The subject matter is admirably condensed, and the work as a whole shows no glaring traces of disproportionate treatment—only the Old Testament history has not, perhaps, been subjected to the same criticism which Professor Maspero has so conscientiously brought to bear upon the other records he has used. The bibliographical information is extremely full, and will be particularly helpful to students who would pursue any special branch more closely. There is a good index and three useful maps, so that the history is as complete as the severest critic could desire. In an appendix, Professor Maspero sketches the chief systems of ancient writing in use in the nearer East, with full tables and syllabaries. A handbook of this kind, consisting of some 800 pages, full of carefully tested material, covering the ancient history of the East from prehistoric times to the Macedonian conquest, can scarcely be reviewed at length in these pages. Professor Maspero is one of the best-informed scholars upon this subject, and this work, like his other brilliant volumes, is a standard authority which no student of ancient history can afford to ignore. He is too careful a scholar for one to differ from him lightly. Certain isolated statements and views, however, are extremely questionable, as when the old identification of Hierapolis (Mabug) with Carchemish is taken for granted; but these are exceptional and do not lessen our appreciation of the valuable handbook with its fascinating story of the dead empires of the East. S. A. C.

At the present time all the standard works on Rome are out of date so far as they deal with the Forum, and satisfactory information about recent discoveries on its site can only be gathered from more or less scattered notices in periodicals, British and foreign. For the general but intelligent public, therefore, Mrs. Burton Brown's account of *Recent Excavations in the Roman Forum*, 1898–1904 (London: Murray, 1904), comes at a very opportune moment. But this is not all. The authoress combines the advantages of a training in classical archæology with residence in Rome, and scholars will find here not a few things which, so far as we know, cannot be learned elsewhere. We have been very favourably impressed with the freshness and originality, as well as with the completeness and general accuracy, of this little book, which should have a wide circulation. This is not the place for a minute criticism of archæological details, but we would suggest that when a new edition is required there should be a revision of the passage on p. 107 which implies that the feuds of patricians and plebeians lasted till the first century before Christ. The Latin occasionally needs correction, *e.g. Curculius*, pp. 17, 222; *occulantissimus*, p. 84; *uso*, p. 95; *Colonna Rostrata of Diulius*, p. 115; to which we may add the rendering 'by the Etruscan shore' in the passage from Horace referred to on p. 136. G. McN. R.

Though Professor Robinson Ellis's lecture on *The Correspondence of Fronto and M. Aurelius* (London: Frowde, 1904) does not contain anything very new, it gives a full and sympathetic account of the literary qualities of Fronto. Due stress is laid on his rhetorical capacity, a side which the survival of his Letters has tended to obliterate. Some news is given of the often expected new edition of the Correspondence. A number of emendations, some of which have been already published, appear in an appendix. G. McN. R.

The portion of Father H. Grisar's *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages* dealing with Gregory the Great has been translated into Italian by A. de Santi (*San Gregorio Magno*; Roma: Desclée, Lefebvre e Comp., 1904) and issued on the occasion of the thirteenth centenary recently celebrated at Rome, in the series *I Santi*. Grisar's work is too well known to require much notice here. If he comes before the world as the Roman Catholic 'Gregorovius,' he is none the less a very serious historian, and one could hardly find a fuller or more trustworthy account of the great pope than that contained in this convenient volume.

G. McN. R.

At the outset of his *History of the Moorish Empire in Europe* (three volumes. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1904) Mr. S. P. Scott expresses diffidence on entering upon ground traversed by Prescott, and in this he does well, for much of Prescott's work will never cease to be valuable. But when the same diffidence is expressed with regard to Washington Irving, those who seek for history in these well-printed volumes have cause to fear that they are astray. This impression is confirmed as the book proceeds. Washington Irving seems to be its model, but it lacks his style, his elaborate old-fashioned graces, and his picturesqueness. It is indeed astonishing how little solid fact ekes out these thick volumes—fact, that is to say, relevant to their subject as stated in the title. The bulk is made up of commonplaces, weak and often incorrect generalisations, repetitions, contradictions, rhetorical overstatements, and excrescences. The writer's championship of the cause of Islam would have made his work interesting had he condescended to state new facts sufficient to justify his unconventional attitude. He does, however, nothing of the kind. He adopts a superior attitude towards things Spanish, and refuses to the heroes of the Reconquest even such slender virtues as they possessed over and above a valour beyond dispute. His hatred of the Roman catholic church amounts to frenzy. Hardly a mention of the clergy occurs without being accompanied by reckless slander of their public conduct and chiefly of their private lives. Typical instances are to be found in vol. ii. pp. 879, 422. This mental attitude seems to tell of a surfeit and indigestion of Buckle. Among rash overstatements we may quote from vol. i. p. 723: 'The incessant march of the Moorish armies for a quarter of a century obliterated every sign of animal and vegetable life' (*sc.* on the plains of Leon and Castile). No footnotes are given, so that it is impossible to find out who is the authority for statements new or extraordinary.

Yet it would be interesting to know, for instance, the evidence for the fact (vol. ii. p. 627) that during the siege of Malaga by Ferdinand and Isabella 'it was well known in Malaga that the agents of the Inquisition, while not yet officially recognised, were present with the army, and were treated with marked distinction by the Spanish Court.' The chronological difficulties, of which the subject is full, are merely slurred. Hardly a date is cited, and the writer ranges at will through the centuries. Though in the list of authorities consulted he cites Arabic books, he makes no claim to knowledge of the language. His transcriptions are erratic; not only are proper names defaced, but common words almost current in European languages assume strange and capricious forms. The letter *jim* has its equivalent in the English *j*, but even here Mr. Scott introduces variety, and we read of *Ghezirah*, *Gebal*, *Hajib*, and *Djihad*. The *l* in *Djalma*, used in the sense of *principal mosque*, is simply a mistake. The list of authorities contains no mention of the *Biblioteca Arabo-Hispana*, edited by Francisco Codera, or of the interesting series of *Estudios Arabes* now appearing at Saragossa; and it is silent with regard to Pons Boigues, the bibliographer of the Arabic writers of Spain (1898). H. B. C.

It is difficult to take a serious view of Herr R. Baldauf's study entitled *Historie und Kritik*. I. 'Der Mönch von St. Gallen' (Leipzig: Dyk, 1903). The author attempts to prove, by the evidence of style, vocabulary, and so on, that the work *De Gestis Karoli Magni*, commonly attributed to a monk of St. Gall in the second half of the ninth century, is really from the pen of Ekkehard IV, the author of the *Casus S. Galli*. An example or two will serve to show the kind of argument which is advanced to prove this point. Both in the *De Gestis* and in the *Casus* the word *iocus* and its derivatives are of frequent occurrence. Since they are euphonious, authors who use them must have the musical temperament; can we suppose that two different monks of St. Gall had an ear? In both works neuter nouns ending in *mentum* are common. Both show a fondness for *tam*, *talis*, *tantus*, *tot*; the *Casus* are about three times the length of the *De Gestis*; if the two books were by the same author these words ought to appear in the former about three times as often as in the latter, which Herr Baldauf asserts to be the case. Both are fond of superlatives, make occasional use of Greek words, such as *Kyrie eleison* and *xenodochia*, and misspell Latin words on the same principles. Both show an acquaintance with the Bible, the *Aeneid*, Sallust, and Einhard's *Vita Karoli*. On these principles any two writers of the early middle ages might be proved to be not two, but one. The most amazing arguments are those intended to prove a remarkable knowledge of Greek literature in both the works under discussion. On p. 54 we are told that when, in the *De Gestis*, Charles the Great speaks of the northmen as 'dogs' heads' there is a plain reference to the battle of Kynoskephalai, and on p. 130 that both works show considerable familiarity with the *Iliad*; but Herr Baldauf conscientiously points out that this is the less surprising because there are remarkable similarities between the *Iliad* and the book of Genesis. It is a pity that he should have devoted so much time to comparisons which end in such results. H. W. C. D.

The third volume of the *Inquisitions and Assessments relating to Feudal Aids*, 1284–1431 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1904), covers the counties of Kent, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Middlesex (including London), and Norfolk. The history of these shires is, however, very unequally illustrated. While Lancashire and Middlesex fill only some fifteen pages each, Lincolnshire occupies 245 and Norfolk 267. The happy Lincoln or Norfolk topographer will therefore find an infinitely richer field for his researches than the student of Lancashire or London history. We are told, however, that in connexion with the former county the returns for the duchy of Lancaster are reserved for separate treatment; but these, we imagine, will include a great many entries that have nothing to do with the county palatine. The indexes are numerous and admirable. Some mistakes made in the arrangements are corrected in the preface. An interesting feature of the survey is the persistence with which the names of ancient feudal aggregations were retained long after they had ceased to be held by their ancient possessors. Thus we have the *feoda comitis de Ferrariis* in 1346, nearly a hundred years after there had ceased to be any Earl Ferrers. Another instance of such survival is the somewhat mysterious entry *feoda comitisse de Bolyngbrok*, which occurs under that same date and on several other occasions. This is illustrated by an analogous entry on p. 175 which speaks of a fief *in manu comitis Lincolnie* in 1303 as *feudum comitisse Cestrie de Bullingbrok*. T. F. T.

The third volume of the *Calendar of Close Rolls of the Reign of Edward I*, 1288–1296 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1904), is the work of Mr. W. H. Stevenson, and is therefore sure to be excellent. As an example of the extent to which these often consulted rolls can, when put together and indexed, yield a harvest of new detail to minute students, we may quote the fact that this volume reveals several fresh points in the biography of the guilty chief justice Thomas of Weyland, adding considerably to the extent already known of his scattered landed property, showing more clearly than ever the pains he took to save it from accidents by jointly enfeoffing his children with it, and in particular proving that Weyland's first wife (whose name I was unable to hit upon in 1899) was Anne, daughter of Richard de Colevill the elder, and giving the marriage portion assigned to her by her father and held 'by courtesy of England' by her husband after her death (p. 160). Moreover this Anne was certainly the mother of John Weyland, while Margaret, the justice's second wife, was certainly the mother of his daughter Eleanor. The index to the volume, the work of Mr. Woodruff, is excellent, but even with Mr. Stevenson's help an occasional farm has escaped precise identification. One or two of these need not have been left so vague as they are. 'Thlenelewey' (co. Flint) on p. 654 is clearly Llanelwy, *i.e.* St. Asaph, and should have been put under its modern names. 'Eagle Forest' is not very illuminating on p. 217, and 'Llanarth Derewen' must not be sought in 'co. Cardigan,' as on p. 605, but rather near Denbigh, where Edward was on the days preceding and succeeding that of his dating a close letter at Llanarth. But the best of index-makers must nod sometimes, and Mr. Woodruff is very seldom asleep. T. F. T.

In his *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Erzbistums Patras* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1903) Dr. E. Gerland has published a number of Greek and Latin documents of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries bearing on the history of the archbishopric. Some of them are now published for the first time, and especially important are the deeds of sales and gifts of land derived from the library of Macerata. Dr. Gerland had the advantage of consulting the valuable papers of Carl Hopf, on which he had drawn for his recent work on the archives of the duke of Candia. A long and valuable introduction traces the history of Patras from the Latin conquest, shows clearly, for the first time, the organisation of the archbishopric, explains the circumstances in which the administration was transferred to Venice, and how, through the short-sighted policy of the Roman curia, Patras was recovered by the Greeks. The editor has devoted particular attention to economic conditions, and gives an instructive account of agriculture and industrial enterprise in the archbishopric. It is to be noted that the Greek documents in this volume furnish valuable lexicographical material. J. B. B.

In her edition of *Grace Book B, Part I., containing the Proctors' Accounts and other Records of the University of Cambridge for the Years* 1488–1511, for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 'Luard Memorial Series,' ii. (Cambridge: University Press, 1903), Miss Mary Bateson carries on the series which was admirably begun by Mr. Leathes by the publication of the register known as *Grace Book A*. The present *Grace Book B* contains both graces and Proctors' accounts down to 1501, after which it contains only the accounts. The work has been done in a thoroughly satisfactory manner, though some readers might have liked a little more explanation of technical or unusual words. On p. xix there is a slight slip: 'the university chaplain paid 1*l*. for the chair of canon law' should be 'is paid' (as is made evident by the Latin). On the same page Miss Bateson says that 4*d*. was required 'from every monk, "excepting mendicants," probably because these last, the friars, that is to say, did not take the Arts course.' But this surely was the case with all regulars. And, as Miss Bateson goes on to point out, the fact of not taking the Arts course was the very ground on which the payment was required. The claim of the mendicants to exemption was no doubt founded on their actual or supposed poverty. The editor is, no doubt, right in her explanation of the term 'gremials,' *i.e.* that they are 'those who have completed their Arts course.' It would be better, perhaps, to say 'those who had taken a degree in the university.' Scholars who had not taken a degree and been sworn to obey the university were not in the full sense members of the corporation. They presumably became gremials on taking a degree in a superior faculty, even if they had not previously graduated in Arts. The 'Bachelor in Geometry' who occurs in these pages is apparently unique in the whole history of universities.

H. R.

The ample literature of the Mississippi Valley finds a valuable addition in Mr. F. A. Ogg's *The Opening of the Mississippi* (New York: Macmillan, 1904), which gives a very full history of the subject from the

first Spanish discoveries to the admission of the State of Louisiana in 1812. The references to original authorities in the notes render the book valuable to students, though the writing shows no special distinction or charm. It is curious to find so careful an author perpetrating the slip that *Walpole* was in 1755 dictating the policy of the British government.

H. E. E.

In spite of the many works on British India there was room for a popular history of the East India Company based on the ample material existing in books, pamphlets, and state papers. This want Mr. Beckles Wilson has supplied in his *Ledger and Sword; or, the Honourable Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies* (1599–1874) (London: Longmans, 1904). The first volume, which takes the history down to 1700, is more satisfactory than the second, which to a great extent covers ground dealt with in numerous volumes. The accounts of the Amboyna massacre (from the English side) and of Sir Josiah Child are especially full. A few slips in the book might have received correction. Burleigh is spoken of as if he were alive in 1599. Mun's *Treasure by Foreign Trade*, though published in 1664, was written before 1628, and Mun died in 1642, so that it is absurd to say, '"Behold then," cried Sir (*sic*) Thomas Mun, who had not dared to air his views during the puritan ascendency, "the true form,"' &c. The Ostend Company owed its origin to more deep-seated causes than the fact that interlopers were in the habit of taking in cargoes from England at Ostend. The venerable error of calling the Caribbean Sea 'the Spanish Main' is several times repeated. A less venial offence is the absence of an index. H. E. E.

Dr. C. Day's *The Policy and Administration of the Dutch in Java* (New York: Macmillan, 1904) for the first time enables the English student who is ignorant of Dutch to reap some at least of the benefit of the mass of material concerning Java which is contained in Dutch books and periodicals. Starting from 'the native organisation' Dr. Day traces the economic history of Java through the period of the East India Company and, after its fall, through the periods of British rule and of the Dutch restoration, down to the present economic policy. Of the need of such a book there can be no question; *e.g.* the account of 'the culture system' current in English authorities, which has been popularised in Mr. A. Ireland's widely read work on *Tropical Colonisation*, would seem, on the authorities here given, far too favourable. In any case the three chapters on the culture system, under the heads of policy, government, and reform, cannot be neglected by any future student of the labour problem in colonies. Dr. Day assuredly holds no brief for the Dutch in all their proceedings. At the same time, depending for the most part on Dutch authorities, he is perhaps hardly fair to Stamford Raffles's character as a man apart from the question of his reforms. Thus it is stated in a note that Raffles 'was charged with making an improper personal gain out of the sales which he instituted.' It is not fair to say this without adding that after an elaborate inquiry by the court of directors at home 'the utter groundlessness of the charges . . . in so far as they affected his honour' was fully demonstrated. Patriotic Dutch historians

have a grudge against Raffles not really as the governor of Java but as, according to their view, the filcher of Singapore, and therefore they can hardly be expected to approach him from an altogether impartial point of view. H. E. E.

An attempt to remedy the fragmentary and incomplete nature of Carlyle's *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* has been made by Mrs. Lomas in an edition in three volumes, with notes, supplement, and enlarged index (London: Methuen, 1904), which is of very great value and interest. Every effort has been made to correct the text of the Letters by reference to the originals, and to place the Speeches on a sound basis by careful collation. The revision is thorough, and the result is a new text which will astonish many who are familiar with the old biography. Welcome, too, is the Supplement, in which the editor has gathered together for the first time a large number of additional letters and speeches. Of these the latter are by far the most important, including those from the Army Council debates as reported in the Clarke MSS. We miss, however, the text of Cromwell's little address to Whitelock on his return from the Swedish embassy, which might well have been included. Other documents are inserted with a view to throwing fresh light on obscure points, so that altogether this Supplement is a necessary and useful addition. Another feature is an introduction by Professor Firth. The essay is brief, but very bright and interesting. Few of us have heard how Carlyle conceived the idea of writing his book and under what conditions he wrote, and all will be glad to read a short estimate of the failings and value of his work. Mrs. Lomas's edition is indeed very well done, and there is only one point on which more is sure to be said. To take a few words from the introduction: 'When a biography has become a classic,' should it not be left so? The present method is awkward. In the Speeches an impossible sentence may still be left in the text with an editorial note giving the original, or Carlyle's words may be ejected in favour of the real reading. This hesitation as to the extent of interference is only natural, but the result is not 'Carlyle,' and not a thoroughly new version. Moreover, it is evidently a difficult thing to sit in judgment on Carlyle's interpolations, and further the editor has made fresh ones in the shape of notes, which are not always in sympathy with the spirit of the original editor. Mrs. Lomas shows so much ability that an entirely new work under her name would be more than welcome. C. L. S.

Nothing could be better done or in more excellent taste than the text of Hobbes's *Leviathan*, which opens the series of *Cambridge English Classics* (Cambridge: University Press, 1904). It is reprinted verbatim from the original folio issue of 1651, the errata being incorporated within square brackets, and some other obvious printers' errors being corrected in like manner. The few necessary changes in punctuation which have been made are enumerated in a note prefixed to the volume. Mr. A. R. Waller, who has taken charge of the edition and has added an index of proper names, is to be congratulated on the production of a beautiful and withal very cheap book. B.

Mr. C. L. Raper's *North Carolina: a Study in English Colonial Government* (New York: Macmillan, 1904) is a valuable addition to the careful monographs on the colonial period of the different states which have been a distinctive feature in the American historical writings of recent years. It is true that a certain monotony results from the establishment of similar conclusions by somewhat similar evidence. Mr. Raper asserts that 'we find a condition of inefficiency, and even chaos, in the executive, legislative, and judicial departments, and we find the same condition in the administration of territorial, fiscal, and military affairs. This was due in part to the lack of intelligence on the part of the crown, to a lack of intelligence, industry, and character on the part of the crown officials in the province, as well as to a lack of intelligence and energy on the part of the representatives of the colonists.' This statement might with truth be made of other colonies besides North Carolina. In the chapters on the governor, the council, and the lower house of the legislature under the crown the history travels over somewhat familiar ground, though the conclusions are always based on the authority of the North Carolina records. The chapters on the territorial and fiscal systems contain a lucid account of a difficult subject. Mr. Raper throughout does full justice to the point of view of the English authorities, though it is hardly correct to write of British (military) colonial policy as 'distinctly one of expansion.' It is curious to find in so careful and learned a book the slip 'cotton, wool' (instead of cotton-wool) in the list of the enumerated articles under the Navigation Act. It may be noted that the book, which is referred to (with the statutes) in this connexion, is not responsible for the error. H. E. E.

In *Russisch-französische Politik*, 1689–1717 (Gotha: Perthes, 1902), a young Bulgarian scholar, M. Matthäus Vassileff, has put together, at the instance of Dr. Gustav Buchholz, a detailed account of the diplomatic relations between Russia and France from the accession of Peter to the treaty of Amsterdam. Hitherto the best account of these transactions had been the sketch which M. Rambaud prefixed to the first volume of the *Recueil des Instructions* (1890). This collection, along with the documents published in the *Sbornik* of the Russian Historical Society between 1878 and 1888, forms the chief material, but the *Letters and Documents of Peter the Great* and *Die Aktenstücke zur Geschichte Franz Rakoczys*, which were not consulted by M. Rambaud, have been used with advantage. Almost half of this useful monograph is devoted to the relations of the two years following the death of Louis XIV, when circumstances at length seemed, in many respects, favourable to a Franco-Russian alliance. The main interest is to determine the motives of the French government in rejecting the overtures of Peter, a policy for which it incurred severe blame from Saint-Simon. There cannot be much doubt that the French statesmen regarded such a policy as practically inconsistent with the Triple Alliance. Whether they were right or wrong is a question on which M. Vandal differs from M. Vassileff. Was the opposition between England and Russia in these years so grave that an alliance with the tsar would necessarily have meant for France a breach with England? M. Vassileff says yes, M. Vandal no. In any

case there was clearly considerable risk, and the choice practically offered to France was between safe inactivity secured by the Triple Alliance and a bold policy to which Peter's proposals invited her. She chose the former because she was politically and materially worn out.

J. B. B.

No family in modern Greece possesses a more romantic and more tragic history than the great Mainate clan of the Mavromichálai, the first volume of whose history has just been edited by K. G. Zesíou (Οἱ Μαυρομιχάλαι. Μέρος Α. Ἐν Ἀθήναις· Ἀνέστη Κωνσταντινίδου, 1903.) The editor, anxious to avoid the partisan feeling which still clings round the history of a family two of whose members slew Capo d'Istria, has made a number of extracts from historians, mostly foreigners, who have described the doings of the Mavromichálai down to the arrival of Capo d'Istria in Greece, merely adding an introduction and a few words of explanation to each chapter himself. He has gone to the best authorities for the period of the war of independence, such as Finlay, Gordon, Gervinus, Pouqueville, and among Greeks Philémon and Trikoúpes. He shows that the first historical mention of the Mavromichálai occurs in a Venetian document of 1690, and he traces the origin of their name to the Mainate use of the word μαῦρα for 'orphans.' He tells the story of how their wealth and prosperity arose from the marriage of one of their number with a Nereid, who was dumb—a legend explained by a union with a rich foreigner who for long could not speak Greek. We first find the Mavromichálai fighting for Greek freedom in 1769, when their leader was 'Skyllogiánnes.' At the outbreak of the war of independence Pétro Bey Mavromicháles was prince of Maina, and he and his family played a conspicuous part in that contest. At the taking of Kalamáta, the battle of Valtétsi, in Euboia, in Akarnania, and in Epiros, the Mavromichálai fought heroically, sometimes with the loss of their lives, for Greece. The volume contains a series of family portraits, some taken from the Pinakothek at Munich, some from the collection of the Ethnological Society at Athens, and a family tree. The compilation is well done, and the name of M. Zesíou is a guarantee for good style alike in the original matter and in the translations.

W. M.

In *Politische Ansichten des offiziellen Frankreich im achtzehnten Jahrhundert; ein Vortrag* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1903), Dr. Adalbert Wahl sketches the growth of the ideas of political freedom and the counter-claims of prerogative in France in the period immediately preceding the Revolution, as exemplified chiefly in the claims of the Parliament of Paris, and the counter-claims of the king. The claim of each to 'concentrate' the nation ended in the victory of the king. The process of development had been going on for some time previously. Dr. Wahl points out that in the eyes of political theorists like Bossuet the liberty of the subject and restrictions on the king were greater under Louis XIV than they had been considered under Francis I. The struggle of the eighteenth century is divided into two parts by the year 1750. Before that year the Parliament was chiefly bent on asserting its right of enregistering laws. Afterwards, under the influence of Montesquieu's *Esprit des Lois*, and

through it of Locke, it tried to assert a claim to represent the people. Locke's idea of a threefold division of powers as adopted by Montesquieu was utilised by the Parliament to support its claim, though the claim actually violated it in spirit; since, while a judicial body, the Parliament claimed legislative functions. In asserting its counter-claim the monarchy theoretically recognised its duty, as representing the people as a state, to see that no one ever suffered innocently—two theories which were to cost the monarchy dear in 1789, when, through the destruction of the power of the Parliament, Louis XVI stood face to face with his people. W. E. R.

M. A. Barbeau's exhaustive and charmingly written account of a remarkable and long-vanished phase of English social life, *Une Ville d'Eaux Anglaise au XVIII^e Siècle* (Paris: Picard, 1904), should commend itself to English as well as to French readers. He has studied most minutely not only the literature directly relating to Bath, but also the journals, letters, and biographies of visitors to, or residents in, the pleasant town whose streets are full of memories of the motley crowd who drank the waters, bathed, danced, and gambled under Nash, the 'king of Bath,' and his less notable successors. M. Barbeau deals with the history of Bath from its earliest beginnings down to its decline and fall in the beginning of the nineteenth century, but by far the greater number of his interesting chapters are devoted to Bath in the time of its glory in the eighteenth century. His account of Beau Nash, based chiefly on Goldsmith's *Life*, lays due stress on the obligations of the town to Nash's powers of organisation, and the indebtedness of the visitors to his regulations for their pleasure and comfort. While 'persons of quality' became reconciled to the give and take of watering-place society, the rough and rustic insensibly acquired some measure of refinement from Nash's insistence on the observance of good manners and etiquette. His rule forbidding the wearing of swords at Bath helped to put an end to the frequent and senseless duelling of the eighteenth century, and thus conferred a direct benefit on society at large. M. Barbeau gives several chapters to the literary, artistic, religious, and scientific celebrities who contributed to the vogue of Bath in their own day and to our knowledge of it in this. Sheridan (whose romantic marriage to the charming Miss Linley is the subject of a whole chapter), Smollett, Miss Austen, Dickens, Anstey (of the *New Bath Guide*), Gainsborough, Lawrence, and many others owed a considerable debt to Bath, either for inspiration or for patronage. Herschel was still living at Bath as a teacher of music and organist when he discovered the Georgium Sidus; Ralph Allen, the philanthropist and organiser of the postal service, lived for years at Prior Park, close to the town; John Palmer, the originator of mail coaches, resided in Bath as manager of the theatre. From these names only it may be seen how wide a field M. Barbeau has covered. His book contains full and useful notes, in which obligations to his predecessors are scrupulously acknowledged. The usefulness of the work is greatly enhanced by the addition of a very complete index and bibliography. The numerous English extracts are as a rule correctly printed; in spite, however, of the evident care which has been taken to ensure correctness,

there are still a certain number of misprints which do not appear in the list of errata at the end of the volume. H. T.

The latter portion (chapters vii.–x.) of Major W. Wood's *Fight for Canada* (London: Constable, 1904) is a contribution of the greatest value to the history of the period. Based on the researches of Mr. A. G. Doughty, the printed portion of which now occupies six volumes, and ignoring all second-hand sources of information, these chapters deserve the hearty welcome of every serious student. The contention that the influence of sea power counted for far more in the final conquest of Canada than has been generally recognised is fully made out. It is well to remember that the British forces were represented by some 15,000 sailors, as against about 10,000 soldiers. Moreover, but for the skilful handling of the ships, which enabled a fleet of vessels of all sizes to penetrate up the St. Lawrence, the subsequent operations of Wolfe would have been impossible. As a specimen of the thorough methods employed by Major Wood may be cited the note on p. 332, in which the documentary authority for the statement that the plan, by which Quebec was taken, was due to the initiation of Wolfe and not to the advice of the Brigadiers, is set out in order of date. The note on the story of Wolfe repeating Gray's elegy, as the boats dropped down the stream, is less satisfactory, and adds little to the note of the late Professor E. E. Morris in vol. xv. p. 125 of this Review. Major Wood does not comment on the use of the word 'to-morrow' in the original account, whereas the boats did not really start till about 2 A.M. It is impossible, surely, to maintain that Professor Robison invented the story. Is it not probable that in his later life two facts stood out from his memory of the past: first, that he had been an actual partaker in that memorable night expedition; secondly, that the great Wolfe had actually said to him the words about Gray's elegy? It is not attributing too much to the fallibility of human evidence to suppose that in later years these separate facts tended to connect themselves with each other. It should be noted that, according to Sir W. Scott, Robison thought that Wolfe might have taken a copy of the poem from his pocket, a yet more extraordinary proceeding, considering the circumstances and the hour. Major Wood's narrative gains greatly in clearness by his familiarity with the St. Lawrence and its shores. Moreover, it is accompanied by a plan of the field of operations which is in every way admirable and greatly assists the understanding of the civilian reader.

H. E. E.

Dr. L. C. Hatch's *Administration of the American Revolutionary Army* (New York: Longmans, 1904) is a careful and interesting study of the difficulties which attended the raising by the American congress of a continental army. That congress made lamentable mistakes when dealing with such questions as the appointment of officers, the pay of the soldiers, and their supplies, is fully recognised. At the same time stress is laid on the enormous difficulties in its path. 'Fifty or sixty men' had, in the words of J. Adams, 'a constitution to form for a great empire, at the same time that they had a country of 1,500 miles in extent to fortify, millions to arm and train, a naval power to begin, an extensive

commerce to regulate, numerous tribes of Indians to negotiate with, a standing army of 27,000 men to raise, pay, victual, and officer.' On all the subjects treated Dr. Hatch throws valuable light, but it is to be wished that he had included in his researches the question of the extent of desertions from the American army. In the appendix, which contains the text of the Newburg addresses, in the letter from Armstrong to Gates of 29 April 1783, Dr. Hatch conjectures an additional 'f' ('break *off*' instead of 'break *of* sentiments like those contained in the anonymous address, and to prepare their minds for some manly, vigorous association with the other public creditors'). 'Break of,' meaning suggest, gives a perfectly clear meaning, while the emendation makes the sentence contradict itself. H. E. E.

The interest of the fifteenth volume of M. F. A. Aulard's *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1903), which extends from 8 July to 9 August 1794 (20 Messidor II—22 Thermidor II) centres round two points: the revolution of Thermidor, and the letter of Albitte, Saliceti, and Laporte denouncing General Bonaparte as a traitor implicated in a scheme fomented by Robespierre to hand over the passes of the Alps to the enemies of the Republic (6 August, 1794). The affair is well known, and forms one of the many incidents in the young general's early career which nearly buried the name of Bonaparte in oblivion. The other point of interest, Thermidor, forms the main subject of the second half of the volume. We are first apprised of the outbreak by the coalition of the Committees of General Security and Public Safety on the ninth of Thermidor, and by the omission of the names of Robespierre, Couthon, and St. Just from the list of members present. It may be noticed that, in spite of the turmoil, the machinery of government continued to work; for, hidden away at the end of the sharp crisp orders of the combined committees, appear the usual dispositions of Lindet and Carnot for the commissariat of the army. Like its predecessors, the volume is essential to the historian for the light it throws on the management of the war and on the condition of the provinces, which can be examined in microscopical detail; while the references to Robespierre before and after the end of July, as in the case of Danton, will give an opportunity to the cynic to moralise on the value and constancy of political friendship.

L. G. W. L.

M. Émile Longin's edition of the *Journal des Campagnes du Baron Percy, chirurgien en chef de la Grande Armée* (Paris: Plon, 1904) is a notable addition to the sidelights on Napoleonic warfare. Percy served through the wars of the Revolution, and was chief surgeon of the Grand Army till 1809. He is a less familiar and a less attractive figure than his successor, Larrey, who was at Toulon with Bonaparte, accompanied him to Egypt, and remained faithful to him to the end. Percy was fifty years old when he first came into personal relations with Napoleon, and the hardships of campaigning were beginning to tell upon him. But he did his duty zealously, and he was much more than a mere operator. He was a distinguished man of science, with a singular

knack of hitting on practical improvements, as Flourens testified; he had broad views, and was indefatigable in his efforts to organise the medical service on a sound basis, and to provide it with trained assistants, instead of taking men haphazard from the ranks. Whether he or Larrey initiated field ambulances seems to be a disputed point. The diary which his fellow-townsman, M. Longin, has brought to light is fragmentary. It begins in 1799 and ends in 1809, but there are several gaps in it. The fullest and most valuable part of it is concerned with the campaign of 1806–7 in Prussia and Poland. The difficulties under which winter operations were carried on in Polish mud, the sufferings of the troops on both sides, the terrible carnage of Eylau, have often been described; but perhaps they have never been painted more vividly than in Percy's diary from its very simplicity and the absence of all striving after effect. How the wounded survived the rough usage they necessarily met with is amazing, but, as he remarks, 'a sick man, exposed to the severities of the most rigorous season, is safer than if he were thrown with 500 others into a big house called a hospital.' He records several interviews with Napoleon, who had a high opinion of him and treated him well. His own mind was divided between awe and mistrust. On 28 Dec. he notes:

> His Majesty is on the march every day, driving everybody to despair, and filling up our wretchedness; but the Emperor has immense views: we must wait for him to carry them out before we criticise or complain.

Two days later he says:

> The Emperor is returning [to Warsaw] with the Guard. Heaven be praised! I trembled lest he should persist in prolonging his stay in this country cursed by nature, where there is nothing to drink but marsh-water, nothing to eat but potatoes and lean cow.

E. M. Ll.

In a little volume entitled *Zur Text-Kritik der Korrespondenz Napoleons I.* (Vienna: Gerold, 1903) Professor August Fournier pleads with great force for a critical edition of the correspondence of Napoleon I. In the first fifteen volumes of the official correspondence the reader is left to conjecture whether he has before him a first draft or a fair copy, or whether the letter was ever sent off at all. The second commission paid more attention to the task before it. From the sixteenth volume onwards first drafts are unsigned, while fair copies bear the imperial signature, and the reader is informed whether the fair copy is printed from an original or not. Further than this the second commission did not go. The editors say nothing as to the relation of first draft and fair copy in cases where it was possible for them to compare the two texts; and MM. Lecestre and Brotonne, who have published supplements to the correspondence, are equally silent. Yet it is clear that a perfect edition should give all the variants, and this not in the interests of textual accuracy only. A comparison of rough draft and fair copy shows how the imperial cabinet worked, how the mind of Napoleon worked. The imperial archives of Vienna contain a collection of some 880 Napoleonic letters, of which some 120 have never seen the light. These will doubtless be published in time by Professor Fournier, who has

meanwhile rendered a real service to historical scholarship by his careful comparison of the Viennese texts with those already published by the two imperial commissions and by MM. Lecestre and Brotonne. An instance will suffice to exhibit the character of the results which may be obtained from this line of research.

Correspondence, No. 7745.—Ayez soin d'envoyer par votre courrier des numéros du Moniteur depuis quinze jours, soit à Berlin, soit à Saint-Pétersbourg.

Viennese Text.—Ayez soin d'envoyer par vos courriers, soit à Berlin, soit à Saint-Pétersbourg, des exemplaires du 'Moniteur' depuis 15 jours. Peut-être ne savez-vous pas que cette méchante bête d'Addington est sortie du ministère. Il paraît que Fox et Pitt y sont entrés.

If Professor Fournier's hint should be taken in France, we hope that a serious attempt will be made to obtain careful copies of all the Napoleonic letters contained in the private collections in England. It would not surprise us to hear that they mount up to five hundred. But it is not every owner who will consent to publication. H. A. L. F.

The *Corrispondenza inedita dei Cardinali Consalvi e Pacca* (Torino: Unione tipografico-editrice, 1903), edited by P. Ilario Rinieri, is a bulky and valuable addition to the collection of diplomatic despatches relating to the sessions of the congress of Vienna. Papal diplomacy was chiefly concerned with the military occupation of Romagna by the Austrians and of the Marches by Murat. The negotiations for the restoration of these provinces to the Holy See are set out at great length, and, incidentally, Murat's intrigues, the doings of various members of the Bonaparte family, the proceedings of Talleyrand at Vienna, &c. The period covered is from September 1814 to June 1815. The volume is well printed, satisfactorily edited, and throws new light on many questions of detail; yet there are obvious gaps, of which perhaps the most regrettable is the omission of all mention of Jules de Polignac's negotiations.

R. M. J.

The second volume of *Louis XVIII et les Cent-Jours à Gand*, edited for the Société d'Histoire Contemporaine by M. Albert Malet (Paris: Picard, 1902), consists chiefly of letters from Sir Charles Stewart to Castlereagh, and of letters from Count von Goltz to Hardenberg. Sir Charles Stewart had been accredited as British ambassador to the court of the Netherlands. When it became known that Napoleon had returned to France from Elba, King William repaired to Brussels, whither Sir Charles Stewart followed him. But hardly had Sir Charles Stewart reached Brussels, when Louis XVIII reached Ghent. As the British ambassador at Paris had been unable to follow the king of France, our government nominated Stewart ambassador extraordinary, and thenceforward he took his place at the exiled Bourbon Court. His despatches, printed here, do not perhaps tell us anything altogether new, but they confirm our previous impressions. Louis, as the least unreasonable man there, seldom fills much space. But we are told a good deal about the absurdities of Monsieur and his friends—how they wanted to name the most unsuitable ministers; how

they marked their abhorrence of Marmont and Victor in the way most likely to rally all the old soldiers of the Empire round Napoleon; how they wanted a Saxon corps to be put under the command of one of the French princes, &c. Like all exiles, the sojourners at Ghent cherished the wildest illusions about popular feeling in the country they had lost, and believed that whole provinces were impatient to rise for their lawful king. Like all exiles, they were unwelcome guests, and aroused 'the extreme distrust of the Dutch government.' These and many other particulars Stewart relates with evident candour. M. Malet complains in his preface that he was furnished with almost indecipherable copies of the despatches. In spite of the pains taken by him and by his friend, M. Lacombe, in revising the text, we have noted at least one bad mistake. Stewart cannot have written 'rulercourse' (p. 167) for 'intercourse.' Count von Goltz was Prussian ambassador to Louis XVIII both before and after the flight to Ghent. His despatches in general confirm those of Stewart. They are better written, and though they give on the whole less information, they contain some curious enclosures, such as a memorandum by M. Guizot upon the state of public opinion in France under the Napoleonic restoration.

F. C. M.

M. Gossez has given us in *Le Département du Nord sous la deuxième République*: 1848–1852 (Lille: Leleu, 1904) an 'economic and political study,' which should be useful to the historian of that troublous epoch of modern France. His treatise is based on the national, departmental, and municipal archives, on the files of the local press, and on such works as those of MM. Thirria and Weill for the general history. It evinces long research, and contains an excellent bibliography. Beginning with the famine and high prices of 1847, the author describes the troubles at Lille on the news of the Paris revolution of February 1848, the economic state of the department, the presidential election, and the futile demonstrations there against the *coup d'état*. His conclusion is that the second Republic committed suicide by failing to remedy industrial and agricultural distress. As a grandson of Bianchi, one of the leading democrats of Lille, he has an hereditary interest in his theme.

W. M.

In *A Century of Expansion* (London and New York: Macmillan, 1903) Mr. W. F. Johnson retraces in a very vivid manner the successive steps in the growth of the United States. The main contention that 'the annexation of the Philippines does not mark any "new departure" in our Asian policy or in our international relations' is supported with much vigour and acumen. The book belongs to the 'popular' class of history in that authorities are never cited for its statements, and the trenchancy of the author's conclusions is not qualified by any doubts. 'The infamous Berkeley,' 'Where Spotswood was bold as a lion Dinwiddie was a poltroon'—phrases such as these illustrate the methods of the book. Mr. Johnson finds difficulty in realising an adversary's point of view; *e.g.* the British case in the Oregon dispute

was surely stronger than it is here presented. The book, however, is eminently readable, in a field of literature where readable books are none too common. H. E. E.

Dr. J. Franck Bright's book which was begun more than thirty years ago as an *English History for Public Schools* has changed both its title and its character as it has advanced into modern times, and the reign of Queen Victoria occupies two out of the five volumes of which the entire *History of England* consists. The last volume (London: Longmans, 1904) runs from 1880 to 1901, and its subtitle, 'Imperial Reaction,' marks the writer's political point of view. His judgments on matters of principle are consistently those of an old-fashioned radical, but his narrative of events is extraordinarily free from partisanship, at least for the first three-quarters of the period of which he treats. After 1895 there is somewhat of a change of tone, but in the earlier part it may even be thought that Dr. Bright is unduly depreciative of Mr. Gladstone's second administration. There is also some want of proportion; and one could have spared, *e.g.*, the descriptive quotations on pp. 226, 232, in order to make room for a short account of the case of Mr. Bradlaugh and the Affirmation Bill, which is left unmentioned. A few obscurities have arisen probably from the necessities of compression. Thus on p. 11 we are told of the second reading of the Coercion Bill on 2 Feb. 1881, but on the following page it is said to have been brought in under the rule of urgency made subsequently. On p. 67 it would appear as though the Redistribution Bill was passed in December 1884, while in fact it did not reach its last stage until the following summer, during Lord Salisbury's ministry. On p. 121 or on p. 172 it should have been mentioned that the proposal for the establishment of district councils in the measure of 1888 was dropped. P. 127: Mr. Parnell was not respondent but co-respondent in a notorious suit. P. 254: General Woodgate was not killed on Spion Kop; he survived some weeks. Titles of offices are not always given correctly: thus 'chief secretary for Scotland' (p. 88); 'president of educational council,' for 'vice-president of the committee of council on education' (p. 186). Mr. Courtney's name is twice misspelled (p. 124). We conclude by expressing a hope that Dr. Bright may be persuaded to reissue his history of the late reign, possibly with some amplification, as a work by itself. A division into chapters and a larger type would make it much easier to read. Its merits are so solid and its independence of view so informing that it ought not to be confounded among school books. C.

Dr. Vinogradoff's inaugural lecture as Corpus professor of jurisprudence at Oxford, on *The Teaching of Sir Henry Maine* (London: Frowde, 1904), was no mere tribute gracefully paid to the memory of a famous predecessor. It was a mature and sober estimate of the value of Maine's method and leading ideas. If, after reading this careful judgment, we are for a moment inclined to say that on the whole it only confirms what we in England have thought and been taught to think of Sir Henry Maine, we must hasten to add that this con-

firmation proceeds from one who is singularly well entitled to tell us that we have not been mistaken, and that few, if any, of us could have stated so accurately the grounds of our belief. D.

Many readers will be glad to possess the collected *Historical Lectures and Addresses* of Bishop Creighton (London: Longmans, 1903), especially since the majority, though not perhaps the most important, of them are now published for the first time. Among these is the inaugural lecture which he delivered as professor of ecclesiastical history at Cambridge in 1885, and which is full of interest and suggestion. Others, on the Friars, on Bishop Grosseteste, and on the congregationalists and baptists, are excellent specimens of the writer's extraordinary range of information and of his power of bringing home the lessons of history to a general audience. E.

The lamented death of Mr. W. E. Hall has prevented the fifth edition of his standard *Treatise on International Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904) from receiving the benefit of his supervision. In Mr. J. B. Atlay, however, the publishers have found a thoroughly competent editor, in whose hands the authority of the work will suffer no diminution. The Hague conference, the Venezuela boundary dispute, and the Spanish-American and the South African wars furnish for the most part the material for the new matter. Mr. Atlay's remarks are especially illuminating on the subject of 'continuous voyages' and the seizure of the 'Bundesrath.' H. E. E.

Mr. Randall Davies's *Chelsea Old Church* (London: Duckworth, 1904) is an excellent though not very critical monograph on the famous old church of Chelsea. It is written in the style and with the spirit of Antony Wood or Gutch. No detail, particularly in the matter of inscriptions and pedigrees, that could be of service is omitted. The book is admirably printed, and has some excellent, indeed really valuable illustrations. It is partly a history of the church, partly a history of the families connected with it, and in each regard a considerable amount of matter which, if not exactly new, was difficult to trace or recover from out-of-the-way publications, has been collected and arranged in a workmanlike manner. Mr. Herbert Horne, who supplies a preface, suggests that 'the capitals of the responds of the arch between the [More] chapel and the chancel of the church,' which bears the crest of Sir Thomas More and the date 1528, were cut after a design of Holbein himself. Mr. Davies does not seem to be aware of the full investigation which Mr. Plummer has made of the questions involved in the passages referring to Cealchythe in the English Chronicle; in one place, indeed, he seems to think the Chronicle was written in Latin. But when he gets to more modern times there seems to be nothing that has escaped his vigilance. F.

The third volume of the *History of Stretford Chapel*, edited by Mr. H. T. Crofton for the Chetham Society (1903), is of more interest

than its predecessors. It is enriched with a number of photographs of local antiquities (for instance, the pinfold) and of old houses, also with portraits of the Trafford family from the sixteenth century onwards. The volume is, like its predecessors, curiously miscellaneous in contents, partly historical and partly local and modern. The medieval history of Stretford, as it may be gathered from the public records, is grouped rather oddly at the end under the head 'Miscellaneous History,' while the post of honour is given to lives of local worthies, some of them far from conspicuous. The account of the Trafford family is as good as can be hoped for, pending the opportunity for a full study of the original charters, which at present appears to be withheld. Canon Raines's copies are reproduced in an appendix, but they contain many passages that call for collation with the original. Mr. Crofton begins his genealogy with Randle, a thegn '*temp.* Canute,' and, noting perhaps Mr. Round's objections, says that 'for literary reasons' he has 'adhered to the form of pedigree adopted by the family.' Mr. Bird, who has written in favour of this pedigree in the *Ancestor*, no. 9, has produced documents to prove the genuineness of the early stages of the line of descent, but he is silent on the question what date we are to ascribe to the Ralph, son of Randle, a contemporary of one of the Hamon Massies, with whom the family history seems to begin. It is, as Mr. Round explains further in the *Ancestor*, no. 10, the date '*temp.* Canute' which cannot be accepted. M. B.

M. Maurice Prou's *Recueil de Fac-similés d'Ecritures du V^e^ au XVII^e^ Siècle* (Paris: Picard, 1904) has been prepared for a definitely practical purpose—to place at the disposal of French students who wish to learn to read manuscripts, and have no teacher at hand, a cheap collection of specimens of the sort of writing with which they are likely to meet in actual experience. Hence, with the exception of two examples of the fifth and sixth centuries, M. Prou has taken his specimens from manuscripts written in Latin, French, and Provençal, all of French origin. For the same reason more than three-quarters of them are of later date than the eleventh century, and an even larger proportion is chosen not from books but from charters and documents. This latter feature forms a special advantage to students outside France; for we possess facsimiles in plenty of French manuscript books, but examples of charters and documents, particularly late ones, are not so easy to obtain. Each specimen is accompanied by a full transcript, with explanatory notes and a description of the original, with bibliographical references. This is all excellently done. We notice that M. Prou has omitted to state the character in which the specimen on plate vi. is written, though he has mentioned this in the table of contents; and in some of the later plates it would have been useful to beginners to indicate the distinction of book-hand and charter-hand. In plate xviii., from an index to St. Augustine, the reference to the book *De divinis Nominibus* (line 28, n. 5) should have been sought not among the works of that father but among those of the pseudo-Dionysius *De div. Nom.* iv., in the translation of John Scotus (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* cxxii. 1135), for this and the three following entries are taken from miscellaneous sources and not from St. Augustine.

R. L. P.

The commemoration at Rome last spring of the thirteen-hundreth anniversary of the death of Gregory the Great included an exhibition of manuscripts of the lives and works of the saint, of early sacramentaries, and of books illustrating the history of music down to the early part of the fourteenth century, preserved in the Vatican library. Of this we are glad to possess a permanent record in the *Catalogo sommario della Esposizione Gregoriana*, prepared by the staff of the library and now issued in a second and revised edition (Roma: Tipografia Vaticana, 1904). The number of manuscripts exhibited was 191, but a good many more are briefly indicated at the ends of the sections to which they belong. Some of the latter are also described under another heading, and cross-references should have been less sparingly supplied. But the list now published goes some way towards furnishing a classified guide to the contents of the Vatican library, now enriched with the Barberini collection, so far as concerns the special subjects dealt with; and this is a very real boon. In the musical section the compilers acknowledge their particular obligations to the Rev. H. M. Bannister, who placed his stores of liturgiological learning at their disposal. It is interesting that an English clergyman should have been permitted to co-operate with the authorities of the Vatican in doing honour to the memory of the founder of the English church. Mr. Bannister's help has been the more valuable since a large number of the specimens of early musical notation are found in fly-leaves of manuscripts of various contents, or appear at haphazard in places where they would not be expected, and only an expert who had gone through the entire library for the purpose could have discovered them. The musical manuscripts are classified according to the type of notation which they present. Throughout the catalogue the places from which the books came is, wherever possible, stated; and an index of *provenienza* is given, as well as an index of the volumes described. G.

The *Illustrated Catalogue of a Loan Collection of Portraits exhibited at Oxford* 1904 (Oxford: Clarendon Press) appears to be a reprint of the letterpress of the first issue with the addition of some forty illustrations. It is to be regretted that the opportunity was not taken to revise the identifications, which are in many cases simply traditional. The portraits here published, many of which are unnamed, form a highly interesting series, and show the development of the art of portrait-painting in England from the small half decorative heads on panels to the large canvases which display much flowing drapery. If somewhat slight, Mr. Cust's introduction is written with knowledge and judgment, and deals with the history of portrait-painting rather than with the pictures exhibited. The biographical notices given are for the most part accurate. But they are wanting in proportion, and while details concerning famous men could have been spared, more facts about comparatively unknown worthies would be welcome. For instance, William Stocke, born in 1528 (not 1524), was called to be one of the first fellows of St. John's College on account of his great learning, and was twice principal (not president) of the allied foundation of Gloucester Hall. In an Oxford publication it might have been recorded that Anthony Blencowe was a trustee under Sir Thomas Bodley's will for the foundation of his library. H.

A List of Books (with References to Periodicals) on the Philippine Islands in the Library of Congress, by A. C. P. Griffin, with lists of maps by P. Lee Phillips (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903), is prefaced by a bibliographical abstract of the most noteworthy authorities on all the topics connected with the islands, and this—as the collection is a large one, containing *inter alia* 1,715 book titles—will be welcomed by students. The *résumé* itself is important and interesting, as it indicates the most valuable of the Spanish historical sources, and shows that, with the exception of the 1814 translation of Zuñiga's *Historical View*, there was no adequate history of the Philippine Islands in English down to our own time. A. F. S.

The *Biblioteca Filipina*, by T. H. Pardo de Tavera (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903), contains a bibliography which was placed at the disposal of the Library of Congress and is here printed. It is given to us substantially as it left the author in Manila, who had bestowed much labour upon it. The arrangement of the 2,850 titles of books is mainly alphabetical, and it is particularly valuable on account of the number of Manila imprints included in it. A. F. S.

Notices of Periodical Publications

The recently discovered Acts of Paul: by the rev. F. Bacchus.—Dublin Rev., N.S., 51. *July.*

Catalogue of Latin hagiographical manuscripts in the public library at Rouen: by A. Poncelet [who prints metrical lives of SS. Maurilius and Briomaglus, a fragment of a Fécamp history, the prologue to *Miracula SS. Ravenni et Rasiphi, Passio SS. Diodoroti et Rodopiani, Laudatio S. Hilarii episcopi Pictavensis, Historia S. Severi episcopi Ravennatis*, the epilogue to a life of St. Briomaglus, *Miracula SS. Sebastiani, Gregorii papae, et Medardi*, and *Translatio S. Vulganii*.—Anal. Bolland. xxiii. 2, 3.

The earliest life of St. Ursmer of Lobbes, an acrostich poem by St. Ermin: printed by G. Morin.—Anal. Bolland. xxiii. 2, 3.

The Passio sexaginta Martyrum and the Legenda S. Floriani et sociorum suorum: printed by H. Delehaye.—Anal. Bolland. xxiii. 2, 3.

Hebrew-Latin shetaroth from Barcelona [1065–1092]: by R. J. H. Gottheil.—Jew. Qu. Rev. 64. *July.*

The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela: edited by M. N. Adler, continued.—Jew. Qu. Rev. 64. *July.*

Coptic inscriptions from Shenoute's monastery [of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries]: by W. E. Crum.—Journ. Theol. Stud. 20. *July.*

Royal Documents and Acta Imperii [1237–1340]: printed by J. Schwalm [who collected them with a view to the edition of *Constitutiones* in the *Monumenta Germaniae*. Prefixed is a document, seemingly of 1230, which makes reference to an unknown constitution of Frederick II].—N. Arch. xxix. 3.

Documents of Albert I and Henry VII for the dauphins of Vienne [1301–1310]: printed by J. Schwalm.—N. Arch. xxix. 3.

Letters from German princes to Philip the Fair [1307–1308]: printed by J. Schwalm. N. Arch. xxix. 3.

Letters of Clement V to Philip the Fair [1310–1311]: printed by J. Schwalm.—N. Arch. xxix. 3.

The Nemus Unionis of Dietrich of Niem: by J. B. Sägmüller [who shows that the title of the fifth tract is *Calles reflexi*, not *Colles reflexi*].—Hist. Jahrb. xxv. 3.

Cardinal Peter Philargi's sermon at the opening of the council of Pisa [26 March 1409]: by F. B. Bliemetzrieder [who shows its materials to have been derived from the tracts of Conrad of Gelnhausen and Henry of Langenstein].—Hist. Jahrb. xxv. 3.

On the materials for the history of the councils of Basle and Trent: by S. Merkle [in criticism of J. Haller's edition of the texts].—Hist. Jahrb. xxv. 1–3.

The preface to Nicolas de Fara's Life of St. John a Capistrano: printed by E. Hocedez.—Anal. Bolland. xxiii. 2, 3.

Georg Friderich Schott and his forgeries of documents: by H. Wibel [who examines in detail the imperial diplomas down to Henry V contained in his collections].—N. Arch. xxix. 3.

Jean-Baptiste Maugérard: by L. Traube [who explores the doings of this man, who, from a monk at St. Arnould's at Metz, became in 1802 government commissioner *pour la recherche des sciences et arts* in the Rhenish departments and used his opportunities for the robbery of libraries. Most of these manuscripts, from Echternach, Erfurt, Hildesheim, and Murbach, are now in the ducal library at Gotha].—Abhandl. Bayer. Akad. Wissensch., Kl. III. xxiii. 2.

History, ethnology, and historical perspective: by F. Ratzel.—Hist. Zft. xciii. 1.

Recent lights on ancient Egypt.—Quart. Rev. 399. *July*.

Recent excavations in Carthage and in Aegina: by Miss M. Moore and the baroness A. von Schneider.—Monthly Rev. 46. *July*.

The rehabilitation of Theramenes: by B. Perrin.—Amer. Hist. Rev. ix. 4. *July*.

On the history of political writing during the transition between the republic and the principate: by R. Pöhlmann [in connexion with the pamphlets *ad Caesarem* often printed among the works of Sallust].—SB. Bayer. Akad. Wiss. (phil.-hist. Cl.), 1904, 1.

The first Christians and the charge of maiestas: by C. Callewaert.—Rev. Quest. hist. lxxvi. 1. *July*.

The attitude of the Flavian emperors towards Christianity: by A. Linsenmayer.—Hist. Jahrb. xxv. 3.

The patrocinia vicorum: by F. Thibault [who endeavours to show that the so-called protection extended to poor landholders by more powerful neighbours during the later Roman imperial period was really a fraud on the revenue].—Vierteljahrschr. f. Soc. u. Wirtschaftsgesch. ii. 3.

The history of magic.—Edinb. Rev. 409. *July*.

Clement of Alexandria.—Church Qu. Rev. 116. *July*.

Pictorial relics of third-century Christianity [in the church of S. Maria Maggiore, Rome]: by Miss M. C. Taylor.—Monthly Rev. 47. *Aug*.

The ancient church of Armenia: by the rev. W. H. Kent.—Dublin Rev., N.S., 51. *July*.

Maximus, bishop of Geneva [elected 512-3]: by M. Besson.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1904, 3.

Classes, wergilds, and coinage of the Carolingian period: by P. Heck [disputing the conclusions of B. Hilliger (in vol. i. 175 sqq.)].—Vierteljahrschr. f. Soc. u. Wirthschaftsgesch. ii. 3.

The evidence for the papal authority over Rome in coins and documents down to the middle of the eleventh century: by J. von Pflugk-Harttung. II.—Hist. Jahrb. xxv. 3.

The exempt position of the Hospitallers: by H. Prutz.—SB. Bayer. Akad. Wiss. (phil.-hist. Cl.), 1904, 1.

The policy of the Hohenstaufen emperors: by A. Cartellieri.—N. Heidelb. Jahrb., xiii. 121.

The French in Apulia and Epirus in the time of the Hohenstaufen: by E. Bertaux.—Rev. hist. lxxxv. 2. *July*.

Marsilius of Padua and Aristotle's theory of the State: by M. Guggenheim.—Hist. Vierteljahrschr. vii. 3.

The retreat of Charles VIII from Naples: by A. Segre [on the negotiations between Milan, Rome, and Venice in the spring of 1495].—Arch. Stor. Ital., 5th ser. xxxiii. 2.

The Cambridge Modern History, ii.—Edinb. Rev. 409. *July*.

Adrian VI: by Bishop L. C. Casartelli.—Dublin Rev., N.S., 51. *July*.

List of nuncios sent to France between 1524 and 1592.—Bibl. École Chartes, lxv. 1-3.

The contest of Paul IV with Charles V and Philip II: by M. Brosch.—Mitth. Oesterreich. Gesch. xxv. 3.

Lady Anne Bothwell [the daughter of admiral Christopher Throndssön, who was deserted by her husband, James, earl of Bothwell, almost immediately after their marriage in 1560]: by the rev. J. Beveridge.—Scott. Hist. Rev. 4. *July*.

The embassy of Girolamo Lippomano at the Porte and its tragic end: by P. A. Tormene [who shows that his fault was probably communication with Philip II, rather improper than actually treasonable, and his end suicide at sea].—N. Arch. Venet., N.S., 14.

England in the Mediterranean [on J. Corbett's work].—Edinb. Rev. 409. *July.*

Voyages to India in the time of Henry IV of France: by C. de la Roncière.—Rev. Quest. hist. lxxvi. 1. *July.*

Wallenstein's designs against Venice [1629]: by M. Ritter.—Hist. Zft. xciii. 1.

The navigation acts as applied to European trade: by D. O. McGovney.—Amer. Hist. Rev. ix. 4. *July.*

William III, Bavaria, and the grand alliance of 1701: by G. F. Preuss.—Hist. Zft. xciii. 2.

The French-American war of 1798–1801: by G. N. Tricoche.—Rev. hist. lxxxv. 2. *July.*

General Dupont at Baylen: by count de Ségnan [who shows that he acted in obedience to Napoleon's express orders and was not properly supported. The story that he surrendered unnecessarily in order to save the plunder he had obtained from Cordova is a figment of the emperor's].—Rev. Quest. hist. lxxvi. 1. *July.*

Napoleon and Pius VII [in connexion with the appointment of baron d'Osmond to the archbishopric of Florence in 1810, and the pope's refusal of canonical institution]: by P. Marmottan.—Rev. hist. lxxxvi. 1. *Sept.*

The deputation of the electoral colleges of the kingdom of Italy at Paris in 1814 [from the papers of its secretary, Giacomo Beccaria]: by E. Verga [illustrating the ambition for at least autonomous administration, a representative system, extension of territory (e.g. to include Genoa), and recovery of works of art from Paris].—Arch. Stor. Lomb., 4th ser., iii.

General Dufour' mentioned by Mazzini in connexion with the disturbances in Savoy in 1834: by A. Stern [who shows that he was a Frenchman, count Gustave de Damas, whom Mazzini by some mistake called Dufour, and who has been erroneously confounded with the Swiss general of that name].—Jahrb. Schweiz. Gesch. xxix.

Memoirs of M. Czaikowski, in the service of the Turks during the Crimean war, continued.—Russk. Star. *Aug.*

The preliminaries of the war of 1866 [in connexion with Bismarck's memorandum of 2 May]: by F. Muth.—Hist. Zft. xciii. 1.

Theodor Mommsen: by J. Kaerst.—Hist. Vierteljahrschr. vii. 3.

France

The life of St. Romanus of Le Mans [attributed to Gregory of Tours]: printed by R. Poupardin [who places it not earlier than the Carolingian period].—Anal. Bolland. xxiii. 2, 3.

The French monarchy in the eleventh century: by L. Halphen [who criticises J. Flach's *Origines de l'ancienne France*, iii].—Rev. hist. lxxxv. 2. *July.*

Letter of St. Louis sending certain reliques to Guy, bishop of Clermont, by the hand of friar William of Chartres [1269], with a facsimile.—Bibl. Ecole Chartes, lxv. 1–3.

Jehan Boine Broke, burgess and draper of Douai: by G. Espinas, continued.—Vierteljahrschr. f. Soc. u. Wirtschaftsgesch. ii. 3.

Antoine de la Salle and his relations with the house of Anjou: by L. H. Labande. I.—Bibl. Ecole Chartes, lxv.1–3.

French protestantism and republicanism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: by G. Bonet-Maury.—Bull. Soc. Hist. Protest. Franç. liii. 3, 4. *May, July.*

The trial of six French bishops charged with Calvinism [1563–1566]: by A. Degert. [Though all were condemned, only one was actually deprived].—Rev. Quest. hist. lxxvi. 1. *July.*

The reformed churches in the south; cardinal Mazarin and Cromwell: by A. Cochin. Rev. Quest. hist. lxxvi. 1. *July.*

The royal council and the protestants in 1698: by P. Gachon. I: The enquiry into the conditions to be imposed on the *nouveaux convertis* [specially the compulsory attendance at Mass]. II: Bâville's proposals. III: The attitude of the bishops; Bâville and Bossuet].—Rev. hist. lxxxv. 2, lxxxvi. 1. *July, Sept.*

The problem of the Man in the Iron Mask: by W. Bröcking [who gives a summary of the controversy, and accepts Funck-Brentano's identification of the mysterious prisoner with the Italian Matthioli].—Hist. Vierteljahrschr. vii. 3.

The nuns of Orange during the reign of terror: by the countess de Courson.—Dublin Rev., N.S., 51. *July.*

The correspondence of Napoleon I: by A. Herrmann.—Hist. Jahrb. xxv. 3.

Michelet and his family: by G. Monod [who defends him against the aspersions of Madame Adam].—Rev. hist. lxxxv. 2. *July.*

Report to the chamber of deputies [8 *Feb.* 1904] *on the reorganisation of the French archives.*—Bibl. Ecole Chartes, lxv. 1-3.

Gaston Paris [† 5 March 1903]: by M. Croiset.—Bibl. Ecole Chartes, lxv. 1-3.——By W. P. Ker.—Quart. Rev. 399. *July.*

Auguste Molinier [† 19 May 1904]: by C. Bémont and G. Monod.—Rev. hist. lxxxv. 2. *July.*——By P. Meyer.—Bibl. Ecole Chartes, lxv. 1-3.

Anatole de Barthélemy [† 27 June].—Bibl. Ecole Chartes lxv. 1-3.

Germany and Austria-Hungary

On the antiquity of the Translatio s. Dionysii Ariopagitae [edited by Koepke in the *Monumenta Germaniae*, xi.]: by S. Rietschel [who argues in favour of the middle of the eleventh century and rejects Koepke's grounds for placing the composition two or three hundred years later].—N. Arch. xxix. 3.

The oldest Bohemian Chronicle: by J. Pekař, continued.—Český Čás. Hist. *July.*

On early Bohemian constitutional history: by H. Schreuer [chiefly with reference to recent discussions of the value of the traditions recorded by Cosmas].—Mitth. Oesterreich. Gesch. xxv. 3.

On the question of the origin of the earliest German taxes [with special reference to the archbishoprick of Salzburg]: by G. von Below.—Mitth. Oesterreich. Gesch. xxv. 3.

The tariff of tolls on the bridge of the Lech at Augsburg: by K. T. von Inama-Sternegg [showing that the oldest parts of the ancient tariff printed in the *Monumenta Boica*, xxii. 4 sqq., probably belong to the end of the twelfth century and the rest to the thirteenth (before 1276)].—Vierteljahrschr. f. Soc. u. Wirtschaftsgesch. ii. 3.

The treaty between Everard of Katzenellenbogen and archbishop Gerard of Mainz [1291]: by H. Schrohe.—Mitth. Oesterreich. Gesch. xxv. 3.

The curia and the church administration of Bohemian lands in the pre-Hussite period: by K. Krofta, continued.—Český Čás. Hist. *July.*

Three documents on the history of Frederick III [1488-1492]: by B. Hammerl.—Mitth. Oesterreich. Gesch. xxv. 3.

Bartholomew von Usingen and his contest with the reformers: by dom M. Spitz.—Dublin Rev., N.S., 51. *July.*

Posts in the seventeenth century: by J. Rübsam [1. The service from Frankfurt to Bremen; 2. A Hildesheim postal tariff of 1669; 3. Postal arrangements at Cologne, 1671-1686].—Hist. Jahrb. xxv. 3.

The mother of freiherr von Stein and her correspondence with Lavater: by A. Stern.—Hist. Zft. xciii. 2.

Kant and Burke: by the late P. Wittichen [who gives reasons for thinking that the former read and denounced the *Reflections on the Revolution in France*].—Hist. Zft. xciii. 2.

The industry of the grand duchy of Berg in 1810, in supplement to the memoirs of Beugnot: by C. Schmidt.—Rev. Hist. mod. et contemp. v. 525, 605.

A memorandum by Christian von Rother on Prussian finance during the campaign of 1813-1814: printed by F. Meinecke.—Hist. Zft. xciii. 2.

Seven letters from Ranke to Friedrich von Gents [1828–1830]: printed by P. WITTICHEN.—Hist. Zft. xciii. 1.

The surrender of Kosnicsy [during the Hungarian campaign of 1849]: by A. SHEPELEV.—Istorich. Viestnik. *July.*

Great Britain and Ireland

Ptolemy's Alta Ripa and Tamia: by C. M. ROBERTSON [who places the one on the Oykell, the other on the Tummel].—Celtic Rev. 1. *July.*

The laws of the Anglo-Saxons [in connexion with F. Liebermann's publications].—Quart. Rev. 399. *July.*

The ancient hundreds of Buckinghamshire: by A. MORLEY DAVIES [who holds that these hundreds are arranged in Domesday Book in a regular order, which facilitates the reconstruction of their extent and shows that their grouping in threes was earlier than the Survey. The names of the hundreds and the character of their detached parts are also discussed; and it is argued that the hundreds are older than the county].—Home Counties Magazine, 22. *April.*

The Northamptonshire geld roll: by J. TAIT.—Vierteljahrschr. f. Soc. u. Wirtschaftsgesch. ii. 3.

Cornage and drengage: by G. H. LAPSLEY.—Amer. Hist. Rev. ix. 4. *July.*

The succession of the bishops of Dunkeld: by bishop J. DOWDEN. III: 1391–1515.—Scott. Hist. Rev. 4. *July.*

Nicholas Radford, recorder of Exeter: by Mrs. G. H. RADFORD [who prints documents relative to his murder in 1455 by the servants of sir Thomas Courtenay, afterwards sixth earl of Devon].—Trans. Devon. Assoc. xxv. 251–278.

Reginald Pole and Thomas Cromwell; an examination of the *Apologia ad Carolum V*: by P. VAN DYKE.—Amer. Hist. Rev. ix. 4. *July.*

Sir John Davis.—Edinb. Rev. 409. *July.*

Oliver Cromwell: by GOLDWIN SMITH.—Atlantic Monthly, 563. *Sept.*

Oliver Cromwell and some of his proceedings as protector [in criticism of Carlyle, S. R. Gardiner, J. Morley, and C. H. Firth].—Church Qu. Rev. 116. *July.*

The Jews and the English law: by H. S. Q. HENRIQUEZ. VI [in relation to Cromwell's policy].—Jew. Qu. Rev. 64. *July.*

Scottish industrial undertakings before the union: by W. R. SCOTT [on the Greenland fishing and soap works company (1667–1785), and the sugar-refining and rum-distilling companies at Glasgow].—Scott. Hist. Rev. 4. *July.*

The diary of Sir John Moore [a severe criticism of the writer and of his editor, sir F. Maurice].—Edinb. Rev. 409. *July.*

Highland place-names: by W. J. WATSON.—Celtic Rev. 1. *July.*

Italy

Publications relative to medieval Italian history [1900]: by C. CIPOLLA.—N. Arch. Venet., N.S., 14.

German publications relative to medieval Italian history in 1901 *and* 1902: by E. VON OTTENTHAL.—Arch. Stor. Ital., 5th ser., xxxiii. 2.

Communications by road and water, ancient and medieval, in the territory of Lodi: by G. AGNELLI [suggesting modifications in the maps of Mommsen and Spruner-Menke].—Arch. Stor. Lomb., 4th ser., ii.

The rural counties of the Milanese: by E. RIBOLDI [on the gradual break-up of the five original counties into smaller units, and the increasing encroachments of the commune of Milan].—Arch. Stor. Lomb., 4th ser., iii.

A new theory on the origin of the commune: by G. VOLPE [in criticism of F. Gabotto's view of the commune as originating from the multiplication of signorial co-proprietors descended from the families of *Procuratores*, which entailed representation for purposes of administration].—Arch. Stor. Ital., 5th ser., xxxiii. 2.

The economic beginnings of Venice: by L. M. HARTMANN.—Vierteljahrschr. f. Soc. u. Wirtschaftsgesch. ii. 3.

The school of Flagellants of Mestre: by U. Castellani. [It was founded in 1314 and suppressed by Napoleon in 1806, but still exists as a hospital and almshouse. A lay institution, its resistance to ecclesiastical taxation and episcopal interference was supported by Venice. It suffered from the Spanish sack of 1513. Its loans to the state in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were complicated by the canon against usury. Its archives are in admirable custody].—N. Arch. Venet., N.S., 14.

The restoration of Jacopo di Dante [under an amnesty of October 1325]: by A. della Torre. [In 1335 a question arose whether he was entitled to its benefits, but the decision is not known].—Arch. Stor. Ital., 5th ser., xxxiii. 2.

The wool and cloth 'of Garbo': by R. Davidsohn [giving evidence that medieval Italy derived not only wool but the art of its manufacture into fine cloth from 'Garbo,' i.e. the Mohammedan west, Al Garb or Al Maghrib].—Hist. Vierteljahrschr. vii. 3.

A Sicilian chapter in Greek [1338]: printed by I. di Matteo.—Arch. stor. Sicil., N.S., xxviii. 3, 4.

The treasury, library, and archives of the church of Santa Maria Nuova at Monreale: by G. Millunzi. II [with eighty-two documents, accounts, inventories of reliques, treasures, and books, dating from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century].—Arch. stor. Sicil., N.S., xxviii. 3, 4.

Marriage customs and ceremonies in Italy at the time of the renaissance: by E. Rodocanachi.—Rev. Quest. hist. lxxvi. 1.

Venice and the league of Cambrai: by A. Bonardi [with extracts from the unpublished diaries of Girolamo Priuli].—N. Arch. Venet., N.S., 14.

The Venetian history of Pietro Bembo: by C. Lagomaggiore. [He began in 1531, and in 1534 the first five books reached the Council of Ten. Book xii., which contains the account of the sack of Prato, was apparently finished in 1543, after a delay in 1540 owing to his election to the cardinalate].—N. Arch. Venet., N.S., 14.

Unpublished letters of cardinal Gasparo Contarini [to cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, 1535–1542, omitted in the correspondence published by W. Friedensburg]: by E. Solmi.—N. Arch. Venet., N.S., 14.

The surveillance of the French émigrés priests in the states of the church in 1793: by G. Bourgin [who prints a letter of count Antonio Greppi].—Rev. hist. lxxxv. 2. *July.*

Plans for the embellishment of Rome under Napoleon: by A. Coulon.—Rev. Quest. hist. lxxvi. 1. *July.*

Russia

Ivan the Terrible and Russia in the sixteenth century: by V. Timostchuk.—Russk. Star. *June–Aug.*

Narva in old times: by A. Petrov [an account of Peter the Great's connexion with the place].—Istorich. Viestnik. *Aug.*

The rebellion of Pugachev [in the days of Catherine II], from the memoirs of Papov.—Russk. Star. *June.*

The Polish constitution of 1791 *in its relation to Russia*, continued.—Russk. Star. *June, July.*

Directions given to the troops at Gatshino during the year 1796 *by the grand duke Paul*: by M. Sokolovski.—Istorich. Viestnik. *June.*

Switzerland

The Acta Murensia and the earliest documents of the monastery of Muri in Aargau: by H. Hirsch. II.—Mitth. Oesterreich. Gesch. xxv. 3.

The Arbongau and its relations to the bishop of Constance and the abbey of St. Gallen: by G. Caro.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1904, 3.

Konrad von Bussnang, abbat of St. Gallen [1226–1239]: by P. Bütler.—Jahrb. Schweiz. Gesch. xxix.

Switzerland at the beginning of the sixteenth century: by J. M. Vincent [an account of the political, social, and religious condition of Switzerland on the eve of the Reformation].—Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in Hist. and Polit. Science, xxii. 5.

Peter Caroli and John Calvin: by E. Bähler [who treats of the former's oscillations between the Roman church and the reformed communion, and in particular with the charge of Arianism which he brought against Calvin.]—Jahrb. Schweiz. Gesch. xxix.

Ordinances of Unterwalden against bandits and beggars [1567–1570]: by E. Wymann.—Anz. Schweiz. Gesch. 1904, 3.

The foreign loans of the treasury of Bern during the eighteenth century: by J. Landmann. II.—Jahrb. Schweiz. Gesch. xxix.

Louis d'Affry, first landammann of Switzerland, and the federal diet of 1803: by M. de Diesbach.—Jahrb. Schweiz. Gesch. xxix.

America and Colonies

The first sailing-guide for Newfoundland: by C. de la Roncière [on the *Voyages avantureux du capitaine Martin de Hoyarsabal*, 1579].—Bibl. Ecole Chartes, lxv. 1–3.

White servitude in Maryland [1634–1820]: by E. T. McCormac [showing that the position of servants under the old system was somewhat better than has been generally supposed].—Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies in Hist. and Polit. Science, xxii. 3, 4.

Religious liberty in America [in connexion with the history of the episcopal church].—Church Qu. Rev. 116. *July.*

Charles Pinckney's plan for a constitution [1787].—Amer. Hist. Rev. ix. 4. *July.*

Papers bearing on James Wilkinson's relations with Spain [1788–1789]: printed by W. R. Shepherd.—Amer. Hist. Rev. ix. 4.

The case of Pental Island [disputed between New South Wales and Victoria, and adjudicated to the latter in 1872]: by W. Harrison Moore.—Law Qu. Rev. 79. *July.*

INDEX

TO

THE NINETEENTH VOLUME

ARTICLES, NOTES, AND DOCUMENTS

LIST OF REVIEWS OF BOOKS

LIST OF WRITERS

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

2

WORKS BY
SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER.

New and Cheaper Edition. With Maps.

In 4 Volumes. Crown 8vo. 5s. net, each.

HISTORY of the COMMONWEALTH
AND
PROTECTORATE, 1649-1656.

*** *This work was originally planned to make 4 vols. 8vo. but only 3 volumes were published during the Author's lifetime. Mr. Gardiner, however, left one more chapter ready for publication, and this forms Chapter XLIX. of this edition.*

It is also printed separately as a supplement to the Library Edition. 8vo. Price 2s. 6d. net.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603–1642. 10 vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. net each.

HISTORY OF THE GREAT CIVIL WAR, 1642–1649. 4 vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. net each.

CROMWELL'S PLACE IN HISTORY. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

OLIVER CROMWELL. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

*** *The text of this book is taken from the Volume on Cromwell in Messrs. Goupil's Illustrated Historical Series.*

WHAT GUNPOWDER PLOT WAS: a Reply to Father Gerard. With 8 Illustrations and Plans. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE STUDENT'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN VICTORIA. With 378 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 12s.

*** *To be had also in Three Volumes, price 4s. each.*

A SCHOOL ATLAS OF ENGLISH HISTORY: a Companion Atlas to Gardiner's 'Student's History of England.' Edited by SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER, M.A. LL.D. With 66 Maps and 22 Plans of Battles, &c. Fcap. 4to. 5s.

OUTLINE OF ENGLISH HISTORY, B.C. 55–A.D. 1901. With 67 Woodcuts and 17 Maps. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE FIRST TWO STUARTS AND THE PURITAN REVOLUTION, 1603–1660. With 4 Maps. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. [*Epochs of Modern History.*

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR, 1618–1648. With a Map Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. [*Epochs of Modern History.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 39 Paternoster Row, London;
New York, and Bombay.

BEMROSE & SONS' LIST.

IN PREPARATION.

MEMORIALS OF OLD HEREFORDSHIRE.

Edited by Rev. COMPTON READE, M.A., Author of 'Vera Effigies' &c. Dedicated by kind permission to John Hungerford Arkwright, Esq., Lord Lieutenant of the County. Demy 8vo. handsome binding, cloth extra, gilt top, with many Illustrations. Price to Subscribers, 10*s.* 6*d.* net. *Prospectus will be sent on application.*

The list of Contributors includes:—The Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford, Rev. Custos Duncombe, Right Rev. Dr. Cummings, and other eminent Writers.

NEARLY READY.

MEMORIALS OF OLD DEVONSHIRE. Edited

by F. J. SNELL, M.A., Author of 'A Book of Exmoor' &c. Demy 8vo. handsome binding, cloth extra, gilt top, with many Illustrations. Price to Subscribers, 10*s.* 6*d.* *Prospectus will be sent on application.*

Among the Contributors will be Lord Coleridge, Rev. Chancellor Edmonds, B.D., Rev. Prebendary Granville, M.A., the late R. N. Worth, H. M. Imbert-Terry, the late R. Dymond, W. H. K. Wright, Rev. D. P. Alford, M.A., G. M. Doe, Miss Alice Dryden, Lieut.-Col. P. F. S. Amery, and other eminent Writers.

JUST PUBLISHED.

MEMORIALS OF OLD OXFORDSHIRE. Edited

by the Rev. P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.S.A., Editor of 'Memorials of Old Buckinghamshire.' Dedicated by kind permission to the Right Hon. the Earl of Jersey, G.C.B., G.C.M.G. Demy 8vo. handsome binding, cloth extra, gilt top. With numerous Illustrations. Price 15*s.* net.

'This beautiful book contains an exhaustive history of "the Wondrous Oxford," to which so many distinguished scholars and politicians look back with affection. We must refer the reader to the volume itself . . . and only wish that we had space to quote extracts from its interesting pages.'—SPECTATOR.

JUST PUBLISHED.

HISTORY OF OLD ENGLISH PORCELAIN AND

ITS MANUFACTORIES. With an Artistic, Industrial, and Critical Appreciation of their productions. By M. L. SOLON, the well-known Potter Artist and Collector. In One Handsome Volume, royal 8vo. well printed in clear type on good paper, and beautifully Illustrated with 20 Full-page Coloured Collotype and Photo-Chromotype Plates and 48 Collotype Plates on Tint. Artistically bound. Price £2. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

'Mr. Solon writes not only with the authority of the master of technique, but likewise with that of the accomplished artist, whose exquisite creations command the admiration of the connoisseurs of to-day.'—ATHENÆUM.

'Written in a very clear and lucid style, it is a practically exhaustive account of the evolution of English Porcelain.'—CONNOISSEUR.

THE CORPORATION PLATE AND INSIGNIA

OF OFFICE OF THE CITIES AND TOWNS OF ENGLAND AND WALES. By the late LLEWELLYNN JEWITT, F.S.A. Edited and completed with large additions by W. H. ST. JOHN HOPE, M.A. Fully Illustrated, 2 vols. crown 4to. buckram, 84*s.* net. Large paper, 2 vols. royal 4to. 105*s.* net.

NEARLY READY.

GARDEN CITIES IN THEORY AND PRACTICE.

Being an Amplification of a Paper on the Potentialities of Applied Science in a Garden City, read before Section F of the British Association. By A. R. SENNETT, A.M.I.C.E., M.I.M.E., M.I.E.E. Demy 8vo. 2 vols. attractively bound in cloth. With many Plans and Illustrations. Price 21*s.* net to Subscribers. *Prospectus will be sent on application.*

JUST PUBLISHED.

TRACES OF THE NORSE MYTHOLOGY IN

THE ISLE OF MAN. A Paper read before the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society. By P. M. C. KERMODE, F.S.A.Scot. &c. Demy 8vo. Illustrated with 10 Plates, paper cover. Price 2*s.* 6*d.*

CHURCH AND PRIORY OF S. MARY, USK.

By ROBERT RICKARDS. Demy 8vo. paper boards, Illustrated. Price 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

'It contains much valuable and interesting matter. The original documents in the appendix are not the least valuable portions of the work.'—WESTERN MAIL.

'Church historians will find a volume abounding in interest.'—DAILY NEWS.

Complete Catalogue will be sent on application.

London: BEMROSE & SONS, LTD., 4 Snow Hill, E.C.; and Derby.

Spottiswoode & Co. Ltd., Printers, New-street, Square, London.